

MUZZLING THE DOGS OF WAR

LORD KITCHENER'S three years are all but over-past, and yet the war goes on. Germany, the only Power which has made more than transitory conquests in Europe, still retains them. Here and there, as on the Isonzo, the Allies have gained some enemy territory, but, if we judge merely by the capacity to take and to hold, on the main battle-fields the Teutonic Empires have so far had the best of the war. It is true that they are being dispossessed, but by a process so gradual that a dozen years at the same rate will not see them back in their own land. And what will be the condition of Northern France and of Belgium when the harrow of war, which has already been drawn hastily across them, is thus slowly dragged back with every tooth biting its deepest and keenest? Our foes are now everywhere on the defensive, but never has the military axiom that the advantage lies with the defender of inner lines received clearer illustration. We outnumber them in men and surpass them generally in the quantity and variety of weapons of offence, yet hitherto we have not been able to break through or to gain anywhere a decisive victory. Each "push" gains a strip of ground but is followed by a period of rest and preparation, and new defences are elaborated to meet new attacks. There might have been a different story if the Allies, who pull so admirably together, had also managed to "push" together, but the overthrow of Kaiserism in Russia, destined in the long run to be to the advantage of the Allied cause, coincided with our great spring offensive and, by the military inaction it produced, robbed it of its complete effect. We may console ourselves by reflecting that that offensive made it possible for Russia to attend to home affairs for a time without the risk of an assault on Petrograd, and that thus a measure of internal harmony has been secured; in any case, a democratic Russia is better than a Prussianized Tzardom. Moreover, there are other grounds of hope, America has already got troops in the field and is busily enrolling her millions, there are signs that Roumania will soon renew the strife, the active support of Greece at Salonika is assured, and there seems no prospect that the submarine, ruthlessly, ingloriously,

murderously employed in sinking comparatively helpless vessels, will achieve its main object, the bringing of this country to terms under stress of starvation.

Whether in view of these circumstances we are likely to see a fourth anniversary of the outbreak of war no mere observer can venture to prophesy. The mind shrinks from a further extension of the competitive annihilation, the mere bleeding-to-death, which a war of exhaustion involves. It may be for this reason that the constitutional Governments of the world view with a strange tolerance the usurpation of their functions by revolutionary Socialism: they perhaps hope that these various unofficial *rapprochements* may introduce division, as indeed they promise to do, amongst the different opposed nations and so induce military paralysis. There are those who urge that we should follow up this line of policy and multiply our efforts to secure victory by disintegrating the Teutonic Alliance, offering more favourable terms to its less guilty members. However that may be, our hopes of a speedy conclusion to the war rest rather on the prospect of such a dissolution than of a crushing victory in the field. Certainly a disruption of the sort seems possible, for it is not loyalty or affection that unites the others to Germany, but only the hopes and fears excited by self-interest. And, little as we know of the dispositions of the dumb, press-deluded populations of the German Empire, there are unmistakable signs that Prussian leadership, never loved but only tolerated as a means of unity and prosperity, will be wholly discredited when the truth of its essential failure comes to be realized amongst them. Our hopes, then, are not ill-founded, and they would turn into certainties if only the German peoples could share our knowledge. But the average German, altogether misinformed as to our intentions, resources, exploits and practices in the war, and kept still more ignorant of the deeds and designs of his leaders, is deprived of the most essential pre-requisite for repentance, a recognition of guilt. Few things about the war are more pathetic than the delusion so prevalent amidst the rank and file of our foes that they are waging a war of self-defence against enemies bent on their extermination.¹

¹ The colossal edifice of falsehood on which this illusion is based has been analyzed by Mr. E. Bevan in his book *The Method in the Madness*. He mentions therein that a certain Herr Reinhold Arton has compiled in two volumes a catalogue of the "lies" of Germany's enemies.

It is we who are waging a war of defence, a war to preserve human civilization from a greater peril than it was threatened with by Attila. And so we must needs go on. To scotch the snake and not to kill it, to leave Prussianism unrepentant and unpunished and clothed with the credit of having held the world at bay for so long, would be to give such additional vitality to that diabolical principle that it could never be finally exorcised from humanity. It would mean that we had fought in vain. If we thought for a moment that the spirit with which we entered this war had changed, that we no longer fought under the banner of Freedom but only under the banner of Mammon, that we were really, as someone has cynically said, "out to destroy Germany's navy and Germany's commerce," then we should agree that the sooner peace was patched up the better. But it is not so. At the beginning of the war we could honestly say of ourselves the words regarding America's aims recently uttered by President Wilson¹—

She seeks no material profit or aggrandisement of any kind. She is fighting for no advantage or selfish object of her own but for the liberation of peoples everywhere from the aggressions of autocratic force,—

for they do not invalidate our right to seek reparation for the havoc caused by the autocratic force of Prussianism and to exact guarantees against its exercise in the future. That spirit has prevailed amongst us in the main. Let us see that we keep it to the end. It is the high cause of freedom, justice and international good-will that consecrates the sacrifice of our soldiers: it is this that would render doubly damnable any surrender to that base spirit of greed, which makes war upon the poor in the form of "profiteering," and plans "war against German trade" under guise of developing the Empire. If we have to face another year of war, let it be in the sacred hope that it will enable us to eliminate yet more thoroughly the Prussian spirit, which is the main cause of domestic and international strife.

But in spite of the prowess of our soldiers and sailors, and the patient endurance of those stricken by the war, victory will not bring us peace unless we organize for it beforehand. We must take the intellectual trouble to diagnose the causes of war and the policies that make for harmony. We

¹ Message to the Russian Provisional Government, June 11th.

must, whilst remaining thoroughly patriotic, cultivate an understanding of other nations, their views, aspirations and interests. We must re-write our histories, especially our school histories, which are too often disfigured by that jingoistic spirit that decries the foreigner and exalts the native as a matter of course. For this reason the institution, since the war began, of two associations, one here and the other in the United States, the object of which is to devise machinery whereby peace may be preserved amongst the nations of the earth, is cordially to be welcomed. These two societies, which have won the adhesion of many influential men in both countries, and which only need to be known to gain the support of all Christian people, have no purpose of interfering with the present war. On the contrary the success of their programme depends entirely upon the thorough victory of the Allies. Their aim is to formulate and discuss plans which will promote amongst the various sovereign states the definite establishment of a peace based upon justice, guided by the moral law and protected by adequate physical sanctions. The American institution is called the "League to Enforce Peace"; it first took definite shape at a Conference summoned under the presidency of ex-President Taft to Philadelphia on June 17, 1915, and it held its first annual meeting in the May of last year¹ at Washington. Almost simultaneously, a group of men in England were engaged on the same problem, but the association which is the outcome of their study, "The League of Nations Society," did not come into public notice till the end of 1916. Both organizations have in view something in the future for which they are preparing. They wish that, before the Peace Conference meets, the delegates thereto and the public opinion behind them should have a clear conception of what a lasting peace supposes, and of the international mechanism whereby it can be given form and substance.

Before the war there were Peace Societies in every land, even in Germany itself. In fact, spurred and stimulated by the ruinous expenditure in armaments in which every great nation indulged, there was a growing sentiment in favour of peace which found expression in multiplied organizations and congresses. The menace of disastrous war had indeed other effects as well. It prompted some men to advocate

¹ See *Enforced Peace: Proceedings of the First Annual Assemblage of the League to Enforce Peace*. Washington: May 26-27, 1916.

a greater and still greater increase in men, ships and munitions, ignoring the fundamental fallacy of such reckless competition. Yet it should have been sufficiently obvious that if a nation can be safe only by being stronger than its neighbours, then every nation must be stronger than its neighbours before peace can be secured. Others more reasonably sought for security in alliances with other states against possible rivals—an arrangement which tended to limit wars in number whilst increasing their devastating effect. Only certain pacifists pushed that idea to its logical conclusion and strove for the establishment of peace by uniting all nations against its wanton violation. We refer here to reasonable lovers of peace, not to the Tolstoyans and other fanatics who think, against all the evidence of experience, that moral force without any other sanction is enough to bring a fallen world to the practice of virtue. Common sense tells us that law needs a physical sanction if it is to guide free will. It is true that the just are ruled by conscience, their wills are in harmony with the law, but the froward necessitate the restraints of force. Therefore, international law, since not all nations are always just, needs all the more an international sanction, a sanction established by federation of States.

Not all the logic of the genuine pacifist, nor the elaborate but merely optional machinery of the Hague Tribunals, could stop the preparations for war or its final outbreak, because an international conscience did not yet exist, and international force was not yet organized to supply for it. The discussions of the Peace Societies were academic and their projects remained theoretical; the average citizen paid no heed to them, the militarist scorned and scoffed at them, the fanatic made them ridiculous by excess. But now the actual occurrence of this stupendous conflict, involving the greater part of the world, has turned speculation and theory into matters of keen and practical interest to all. The organizers of peace are no longer called visionaries: they are the hope of humanity. On that head we have abundant testimony. Early in the war ¹ Mr. Asquith, after describing the pacifist ideal, the idea of public right, as "finally, the substitution for force, for the clash of competing ambitions, for groupings and alliances and a precarious equipoise, of a real European partnership, based on the recognition of equal right and established and enforced by a common will," went on to declare:

¹ Speech in Dublin, Sept. 25, 1914.

A year ago that would have sounded like a Utopian idea. It is probably one that may not, or will not, be realised either to-day or to-morrow, but if and when this war is decided in favour of the Allies, it will at once come within the range and before long within the grasp of European statesmanship.

And on the second anniversary of the outbreak of hostilities the same statesman further developed this enthronement of public right as the arbiter of nations.

I will tell you [he said] what I understand it to mean—an equal level of opportunity and of independence as between small States and great States, as between the weak and the strong: safeguards resting upon the common will of Europe, and, I hope, not on Europe alone, against aggression, against international covetousness and bad faith, against the wanton recourse in case of dispute to the use of force; finally, as the result of it all a great partnership of nations federated together in the joint pursuit of a fuller and freer life for countless millions, who by their efforts and their sacrifice, generation after generation, maintain the progress and enrich the inheritance of humanity.

Later and more emphatic still is the witness of that great soldier, who is also a statesman and a scholar, General Smuts, who, speaking at a meeting in support of the League of Nations Society on May 14th of this year, said:

The subject is no longer merely academic, no longer Utopian. If the war had done nothing else it had, at any rate, stamped into the hearts of millions of men and women an intense desire for a better order of things. We see the results in a meeting like this, where we have not only gathered together the dreamers, idealists and visionaries who are the salt of the earth, but the practical men, and the men of blood like myself.

And then to the consolation of all Christians who read his words this eminent soldier stated his disbelief in that favourite thesis, both of the agnostic who disbelieves in Providence and of the Christian who does not believe enough in Christ,—the inevitability of war.

We have seen in this war [he said] the most criminal disregard of all laws human and divine, we have seen civilization itself almost crumbling to pieces. Yet this war is not due to any super-human agency,—this war is man-made. Human intelligence, human stupidity, human greed and suspicion are the basis of this calamity. What the human intelligence can do the human intelligence can undo. This is not the occasion to fold our

hands and bow our heads before the storm. This is a time for action.

It is, then, in a hope born of the very awfulness of the alternative, it is in answer to the high aspirations of countless hearts, that these two societies are seeking to satisfy the demands of the crisis, and taking advantage of this universal cataclysm to rebuild international relations from the very foundation. Unless there is a radical change in those relations in the future reconstruction, there will lie before us nothing but a prospect of menace and suspicion and terror indefinitely prolonged. The conviction that inspires these projects is that, unless we devote all our energies to removing the causes of war, we shall have to consume all those energies in repairing its effects. If occasion is not taken of this unprecedented opening of men's minds to the true character of human warfare in order to mould public opinion in favour of its abolition, all our heroic sacrifices will avail nothing and civilization must perish under a regime of brute force. We are witnessing the bankruptcy, not of Christianity¹ as foolish men have said, but of an international system that repudiated Christianity, and elevated self-interest above morality. Let us now recognize that system by its inevitable fruits, and consider carefully, eagerly and sympathetically every project that will help us to get rid of it. We hope there is no one, out of Bedlam, who is not willing to support any plans for the perpetuation of international peace which promise to be effective and do not unduly interfere with the autonomy and progress of Sovereign States.

The programmes of the American "League to Enforce Peace" and the British "League of Nations Society" are almost identical in substance, and are alike certainly in this, that they do not travel beyond the range of the reasonable and the practical. They are short in statement, limited in scope, and easy of understanding. They are concerned only with international disputes and contemplate no interference with the internal affairs of each State. Both of them aim at embracing as many of the Great Powers as possible: indeed, the full success of each depends upon the adhesion of practically all. Each proposes, then, that these States should form a League and pledge themselves not to go to war with any member of it before first submitting the cause of dispute,

¹ If all men were Christian, Bernhardt himself has written, there would be no war.

if justiciable,¹ to an international tribunal, and, if not justiciable, to a council of conciliation. The League as conceived by both societies does not concern itself with the rights and wrongs of the dispute: it is chiefly interested in securing the world against a sudden breach of peace and providing time for a sober hearing of both sides, so that war, if it does ensue, is really, as Christian morality demands, a last resort. However, the British League goes further than the American in this: both propose to employ force to bring about the submittal of the case for *either* arbitration or conciliation: neither desires to enforce the recommendations of the Council of Conciliation, but the British would forcibly insist upon *judicial* decisions being respected. Other points of difference are that the British League aims at protecting any one of its members from attack by an outside enemy who will not submit his case for consideration. There is no such provision in the American programme. On the other hand, the American League provides for the holding of periodic international conferences to formulate and codify rules of international law, which the British League omits to do.

It will be seen that these proposals differ from the provision for arbitration already in existence at the Hague and from many arbitration treaties already in force, in the fact that they attach a physical sanction to the refusal to arbitrate or seeks means of conciliation and, in the British association, to the refusal to accept a judicial award. This may seem to many lovers of peace a very moderate step in advance, but in reality it embodies the most essential function of an international society—the readiness to aim at and enforce ideals which are not merely national. It is, moreover, as much as can be prudently done at present, and, moderate as it is, it will be sure to excite opposition from those who are loth to see any bounds whatever set to the freedom of action of the Sovereign State in important matters. They think it a derogation from its dignity and independence to be obliged, even by its own voluntary contract, to submit its disputes to an outside body and, in the case of legal judgments,

¹ Not all disputes turn on legal points, such as the interpretation of a treaty, the determination of boundaries involving treaty rights, and such questions of international law and fact. Hence the most necessary distinction between cases for legal decision and cases for consideration, with a view to friendly recommendations. These latter non-justiciable disputes, arising from economic rivalries and questions intimately affecting honour or vital interests, most frequently form *casus belli*.

to abide by the result. These men, though they do not say so openly, implicitly assert that no nation, if it thinks it has the power to assert its claims against an adversary, will consent to state its case before a tribunal. It will rather try to have its own way by the exercise of its own might, right or wrong. This, we admit, is the old and still quite common conception of national duty, but it is a conception which dishonours the nation regarding which it is held. No State is above the divine law which enjoins just dealing. To try to gain by violence what one fears to submit to a court is a sign that self-interest is preferred to justice, especially when, as provided in these projects, one is still free in the more important cases, the non-justiciable ones, to set aside the recommendation, and turn to arms. It is apposite to remember that neither the United States nor the British Empire have thought their sovereignty compromised by an agreement of the sort, for these two Powers have recently entered upon treaties of precisely the character contemplated by the League.¹

This illustrates another happy characteristic of these projects, viz., that they are logical developments of already existing arrangements and involve no great untried and risky advance on previous experience. Nay, it may even be claimed, as it actually was by Mr. Herbert Samuel not long ago,² that a League of Nations to put down wanton war already exists. The aim of the Allies in this terrible struggle is precisely to enforce peace, to punish wanton aggression, to re-establish and maintain the supremacy of law between nations. The experiment is being made before our very eyes, and on its issue, attempted as it has been under the hardest imaginable conditions against an enormously strong group of Powers, will depend the world's judgment on the feasibility of this idea. What has been done in these circumstances is a good earnest of the measure of success to be hoped for when the one menace to the peace of the world has been rendered militarily impotent and the victorious nations organize for peace.

Furthermore, with a view to making recourse to war still more remote, both sets of proposals insist on the force to be applied to defaulting members being in the first instance not military but economic. How powerful a weapon a quasi-universal boycott could be need not be pointed out, and the threat

¹ Notably the treaty ratified in November, 1914.

² At the Lord Mayor's Banquet on Nov. 9, 1916.

of it would speedily bring to reason those in the recalcitrant nation who, as things are, have the most power, viz., the moneyed class. Moreover, the open discussion of claims before a public tribunal would have another very salutary consequence. Diplomacy would cease to be secret, and public opinion, the views of those who have most to lose by international conflicts, the actual combatants and their dependents, would be brought to bear upon the value of national claims and interests. We do not pretend that this influence would always make for peace, but at any rate the people most concerned would know beforehand what was impending and make their choice with their eyes open. The principal effect of the proposed League, the establishment of a considerable *ante-bellum* moratorium, would do away with all hasty and impulsive action, with brutal ultimatums, for instance, like that of Austria demanding the submission of Servia in 48 hours, and allow Time, the great healer, room for action.

Such being the nature of the need revealed to us by the war, and such the projects suggested to meet it, we may ask what are the prospects of their acceptance? We may make an *a priori* answer and say that, unless the world has gone mad, they or something very similar *must* be accepted. The alternative on which we have already dwelt is simply a repetition on a larger scale of the nightmare of war-preparation followed by a more appalling catastrophe than the present. Will the world learn that lesson? Many of our popular writers are far from accepting it. The press is full of articles on after-war conditions, unsound in morality, false in logic, full of the very Prussianism against which we are fighting. We shall have to work hard in order to counteract this pernicious teaching in our midst, and we may take courage from the fact that the general idea of a future international agreement to preserve peace has already met the acceptance of all the nations concerned. The Allies, in their historic reply to President Wilson's Note of December 20th, declare "that they associate themselves whole-heartedly with the plan of creating a League of the Nations to ensure peace and justice throughout the world." The German Government, less plainly, states, in answer to the same Note, that "it will when the moment shall have come be ready with pleasure to collaborate fully with the United States in this exalted task." The Russian autocracy has been overthrown since these answers were given, and America, which is solid for international harmony, has joined

the Allies "to make the world safe for democracy." All, then, would seem plain sailing for the formation of the League, but the inherent difficulties of the task are tremendous and must be fairly faced.

It presupposes in the first place that by the issue of the war, and the decisions of the Peace Conference, justice is substantially satisfied. No nation great or small should have thereafter cause to complain of any serious injustice removable but not removed. Consider the number of claims, sound or otherwise, that will have to be sifted and adjudicated upon before all aspirations in Europe alone can be fairly dealt with.

We may take from President Wilson a general statement of what international justice means:

First, every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live. . . .

Second, the small States of the world have a right to enjoy the same respect for their sovereignty and for their territorial integrity that great and powerful nations expect and insist upon.

Third, the world has a right to be free from every disturbance of its peace that has its origin in aggression and disregard of the rights of peoples and nations.¹

It is clear that much will have to be done, even when militarism is destroyed, before that programme is fulfilled, yet until it is accomplished a League of Nations might operate simply to perpetuate injustice. Happily, the Russian Revolution has advanced us many degrees towards a proper readjustment. That young democracy has waived all the claims of Tsardom. Emancipated Poland will be really free, Finland will regain its autonomy, the smaller northern States may lay aside their fears, neither Constantinople nor the Dardanelles remain objects of desire—an immense difficulty clearly has been swept from the path of the Peace Conference by Russia's repudiation of old dynastic ambitions. But everyone must see the dangers that lurk in the first requirement. What constitutes a people? Community of descent? Is the world to be split up into autonomous *races*? Nothing, if such a thing were possible, would be more fatal to its peace. To accentuate race-differences is to multiply causes of friction. The more races can co-mingle and unite in nations, the better both for the nations and the races: a nation, as Acton has pointed out, substitutes an ethical bond for one merely physical. Moreover, to be capable of separate existence as a

¹ Speech at League to Enforce Peace meeting, Washington, May 27, 1916.

nation a community should be sufficiently large to be substantially self-sufficient, and contain at least the elements of social progress. It would be madness to return to the tribal system. Far better is it that different races, however grouped, should try to understand and appreciate each other. On the other hand—

if a population of a certain race and language find it impossible to live under the same political system as others of a different race and language, it is no doubt best not to force them to do so, and this is especially the case when there is political oppression. But this process cannot be carried out indefinitely.¹

Assuming then a fairly equitable rearrangement of the warring communities as the result of the Peace Conference, it will still leave millions of men under what they may call alien rule,—Poles in Germany and Germans in Poland, and so forth. The only remedy for that state of things is a really national Government which makes no unfair distinction amongst its subjects on the score of race. The idea of "subject races" amongst those on the same plane of civilization should become an anachronism. Few things have done more to perpetuate disunion at home than the foolish talk, still much in the mouths of our jingoes, about "Anglo-Saxons" and the "Celtic Fringe." Membership of a nation should connote full national rights, for discrimination on the score of race is just as objectionable as discrimination on the score of religion.

It is perhaps not to be expected that a fully satisfactory settlement will be at once attained; still, the peace of the world need not therefore be further disturbed, since in the Council of Conciliation, permanently established, there will exist a method of redress more rational and humane, less costly and less uncertain in effect, than the brutal method of war. The proposed League does not stereotype the *status quo*, but provides a reasonable means of readjustment whenever circumstances call for it. We need not further discuss the machinery to be set up, the method and scale of representation on Tribunal or Council of the different signatory Powers, and so forth. Such details may be found discussed in the publications of the League of Nations Society,² and at greater length in a pamphlet called "Proposals for the Prevention of Future Wars."³ Our final and most important point is that

¹ F. F. Urquhart in *An Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (1916, Macmillan), pp. 59—60.

² Central Buildings, Westminster, W. 1.

³ George Allen, London, 18.

the most elaborate and carefully devised machinery will be of no avail unless there is the will and inclination to use it. "You must begin with the hearts of men," says General Smuts. Given good-will and mutual confidence, the Tribunals of Arbitration already established at the Hague would have prevented war, or at least allowed time for the views of those most concerned to be ascertained. And so the problem before humanity is how to induce such a spirit of good-faith amongst the Powers, how to create an international mind and conscience, (which is quite another thing from an anti-national cosmopolitanism,) how to persuade peoples and through them Governments that the prosperity of each nation makes for the prosperity of all. As long as even one great Power remains convinced that, in international dealings, its own interest as it conceives it may rightly take precedence of justice and morality, this spirit of confidence will be hard to establish. Well, this is the choice now before the nations. An international conscience swayed by international law and promoting universal peace, or the rule of force, a ruinous competition of armaments, crushing taxation, oppression of the poor, arrest of social progress, and ever-recurring, ever more desperate warfare.

Is there indeed a choice? Or are we so blind to the signs of the times as not to see that the workers of the world, the "common people," those that perish in the field and starve at home, are determined to have no more war, and will insist on their Governments forming this League of Nations to establish peace, and declaring war on those social conditions which prevent them leading human lives? If, as everybody now can recognize, all that we have suffered from three years of actual warfare and from many previous years of war preparations is the price which the nations have elected to pay for the privilege of being unshackled by the moral law in their dealings with each other, surely the universal demand will be for a means by which this moral law can henceforth be made effective.

It is clear [said President Wilson¹] that nations must in the future be governed by the same high code of honor that we demand of individuals. We must indeed, in the very same breath with which we avow this conviction, admit that we have ourselves upon occasion in the past been offenders against the law of diplomacy which we thus forecast; but our conviction is none

¹ "League to Enforce Peace" Meeting, May 27, 1916.

the less clear, but rather the more clear, on that account. If this war has accomplished nothing else for the benefit of the world it has at least disclosed a great moral necessity and *set forward the thinking of the Statesmen of the world by a whole age.*

It will indeed be a notable advance when the principle of order and the means of enforcing it, which exist in every civilized community, are extended to the whole civilized world. We need not expatiate on what has delayed this advance, but it is plain that the divisions amongst Christian bodies which have blurred the message of Christianity and paralyzed its unifying force are largely responsible for international anarchy. Only by emphasizing the principles which Christianity inculcates—that God's law should guide the nations in their mutual dealings, that aggressive warfare is always unjust, that war is not really inevitable, that war is not really necessary for human progress, that international honesty is the best policy, that wealth is not the highest good even in the natural order—can we hope that the machinery, provided by these Leagues will become possessed of the requisite motive-power? All Christians should support them, as their aim is thoroughly Christian. The value of such propaganda as they exercise lies in the fact that public opinion will be thereby educated to discard the immorality which denies the Christian ideal, to realize more and more keenly, and to give corporate expression to the conviction, that peace founded on justice is the highest interest of mankind, and war, if sometimes necessary, is always an evil. If the peoples who have suffered so terribly can make their voices heard at the Peace Conference their one plea will be for the extirpation of the causes of war—especially of that basest of motives, the desire for unjust or excessive gain. For this reason we have always viewed with distrust the movement to restrict German trade after the war as one which may easily pass the bounds of justice and will certainly pass those of expediency. Prevent by all and every means the *abuse* of German trade, make the country as far as may be self-supporting, but do not by punitive restrictions or discriminating tariffs, hamper a vast population in their means of livelihood, and thus maintain a constant source of ill-will. Room must be found in the future Society of Nations for a regenerate Germany no longer ruled by soldiers and Junkers, a Germany which shall have disavowed its pernicious philosophy of militarism and

its ridiculous assumption of superior civilization. And it would be well for that international conscience which it is hoped to create if all nations would formally disavow, as Russia has done and America too through her President, those immoral principles which they have so often put into practice in the past, and enter the Concert of Nations with humbled and contrite hearts.

J. KEATING.

THROUGH DARKNESS

. . . "La vostra miseria non mi tange,
Ne fiamma d'esto incendio non m'assale."

WHEN Dante went to hell one guided him
Whose feet were firm upon the perilous way,
Whose look shot clear through vapours foul and dim

That hid the far-off shining of the day;
Whose heart was brave toward evil and so wise
That subtlest guile must own his nobler sway.

But these had not sufficed—not the keen eyes,
The steadfast feet, high heart that knew no fear,
But for her voice who sang in Paradise,

Whom in her peace our sorrow came not near
Nor flames of death assailed with venomous tongue,
But spared her tenderness, her joy austere . . .

Now there is hell on earth, rivers upflung
Of blood and murk and hate—a bitter tide
Whelming all gracious things and fair and young.

May such as brave its horror take for guide
That Wisdom still, and by his counsel move
And constant therein many days abide.

But may they, like the poet, look to Love
Whose face of beauty still no misery mars,
Who walks among the Blessed far above,
Singing forever with the singing stars!

G. M. FAULDING.

A NEWSPAPER WRAPPING

JOHN JAMESON was at work by the big window of the little room behind his shop.

It was a quite ordinary china shop but, as both the village and its over-shadowing neighbour the big house knew, the craftsmanship of its owner was not quite ordinary, owing perhaps as much to qualities of character in the worker as to a command of technique and manual skill.

Before him just now, for instance, upon the table which held the medley of materials necessary for the healing of injured pottery, lay a Derby plate. Nor, though there was no example of that ware any more than of Chelsea, Bow or Worcester among his stock, was it by any means uncommon for still more valuable ceramic specimens to be entrusted to him for repair.

The plate was set on edge between two blocks of wood so that the weight of the pieces he had just inserted would tend to keep them in position. That finished, a Worcester cup in ruins, and a jug from which the long slender handle had been broken, stood at his elbow awaiting their turn. The shop bell summoned him, however, before he could begin upon either.

He removed the spectacles he wore for fine operations and went to answer the call. His customer, a Mrs. Delaware, the owner of the plate, had come to enquire after the condition of her valued possession.

"The repairing should have been done as soon after the breakage as possible, Madam," Mr. Jameson said, with a hint of slightly sad reproach in his voice, "When the broken fragments are allowed to lie about and rub together, their edges get chipped, and the joint cannot be so fine and close."

"Oh, I didn't know," Mrs. Delaware returned airily, "I'm afraid it's been lying by for some months. I kept putting it off, though I always meant to have it done."

The china-dealer nodded his head. He remembered the soaking and the cleansing with an old nail-brush to remove the grit and dirt her carelessness had necessitated, and could not in his mind exonerate her from blame, though it was not permitted him to speak more clearly.

"I took care the pieces were clean and warm before I fitted them in, Madam," he said, "and I hope to make as good a job of it as may be."

"Warm?" Mrs. Delaware exclaimed. "Dear me, how extraordinary; it really sounds quite like the treatment of a wound."

"Which is, after all, just what it is," Mr. Jameson muttered to himself, as with ceremonious dignity he bowed her out of the shop.

He returned to his workroom when his client had departed. He was accustomed to spend daily many happy hours therein, tasting, as was but fair, the joy of a good craftsman in the exercise of his skill. Yet beyond and above the satisfaction afforded him on this plane of life there was a strange and secret hunger within John Jameson which no one of his friends or acquaintances suspected or could have understood. Religious yearnings did not, in the village, fall under the heading of a generally recognized want.

The peculiar ache, however, from which he suffered in hours of solitude was, as a rule, reserved for his evening hours after the closing of the shop, and at present as artist-craftsman he absorbed himself in the Derby plate. The cement had not as yet thoroughly set and hardened, but the joint would, he trusted, in its final result defy detection. He was reminded by the triangular fracture of the outline of the map of India, for Mr. Jameson was a reader as well as a manual worker.

Then he ran his eye over the miscellaneous collection covering the surface of the table, from the heap of tape, string and fine copper and iron wire for "binders" to the lump of beeswax which, when softened, served as a convenient holder for delicate ornaments. Not discovering what he needed for his next job, he opened a cardboard box and took therefrom some sticking-plaster in long strips for his operation upon the delicate cup. He had always a clear plan of action, and as an experienced workman would not make the mistake of attempting the joining too many pieces at once.

He arranged the bits carefully in order, and then into pairs of adjacent parts, reducing so his twelve fragments to six pairs. The day following he would simplify the number to three on its way to unity. By this method of successive pairing he could have put together a hundred atoms.

The shop bell then rang again, Mr. Jameson was glad to

find that it heralded an interesting case; a messenger, heavy-laden, from the caretaker up at the big house, at present tenanted only by servants to prepare for the advent of the new owner. The boy therefrom, of boot-blackening and knife-cleaning profession, fidgeted in the shop. If he had not held the parcel in his arms he would, Mr. Jameson divined, have been fingering the wares.

"Hullo," he said, holding out his burden at the shopkeeper's appearance, "there ain't nowhere I can stow this 'cept the floor."

Mr. Jameson accepted it with reverential care, not knowing what it might contain, while the errand boy plunged into the explanation of matters.

"Cook's Irish, you see," he commented, with fine discrimination of racial attributes, "and dead sure to have a smash now and again." There was not lacking, Mr. Jameson noted, a fiendish delight at the inevitability of the tragedy.

"Anyway, she's done it this time, a real bad 'un, and all along of too much cleanin', if you ask me."

At this point of the narrative the china-dealer, having unpacked the newspaper wrappings, gingerly lifted out their contents. Two, three Copeland plates were in pieces.

"You're quite sure *all* the bits, every scrap is here?" he queried anxiously.

"Certain sure," the boy said. "While cook was a doin' the mournin' I picked 'em up myself. There wasn't nothin' Chinese left on *that* floor."

"I can't promise these under a week, tell Mrs. Parry," Mr. Jameson said cautiously. "I've some other jobs I must finish first."

"Oh, that'll do all right I 'spects," the youth returned. "Family's not arrivin' just yet. You fix 'em up and I'll be hoppin' down again come next Wednesday," and he departed whistling, glad to be rid of his responsible burden.

The shopman carried the parcel into his workroom and deposited it on a spare corner of the table. Next he unlocked a safe close at hand, and lifting out the broken plates from their coverings placed them, not without tenderness, within.

Then methodically he turned to fold the newspaper, and as he did so something caught his eye which stopped him in his task. The outer wrapping was an old *Daily Telegraph*: it was nothing on that which had attracted his attention, but some small bits of the broken china had been screwed up

separately, and it was a sentence on this inner parcel that had shot like an arrow into his consciousness.

Picking up the torn sheet which contained it, he folded and placed it in his pocket. After supper he would read its context. There was no time now: Maggie was already calling him impatiently.

He ate his food absent-mindedly, and after that, when the table was cleared, the sentence got between him and his simple accounts which it was his habit to total up each day.

He was glad when it was done and he could allow himself the leather arm-chair and his pipe. He had meant to continue reading *Macaulay's Essays*, but the fragment of newspaper claimed precedence.

He took it out of his pocket and looked it carefully over to discover how much matter he possessed. It was the immediate context of the burning phrase he wanted to see; of the two words which had thrummed in his heart incessantly since he read them—"Perpetual Adoration."

Why, no human being could manage that! It would be trenching upon the work of the Angels. It was their function, of course, but not possible for men. Where was there such a thing upon earth? What could the greatly daring words mean?

He spread the paper with hands which trembled a little, and read once more "Perpetual Adoration."

A tear in the paper beneath, so that the words continued abruptly. . . . "appeal for help during the War to maintain the number of candles necessary for continual Exposition. The Adoration is continued day and night unceasingly and has never been interrupted since the Foundation of the Order, having persisted through the troublous period of" A second gap where the paper had been jagged, and on the atom remaining two words, "Blessed Sacrament."

John Jameson sat back musing. Though a deeply religious man he had, like perhaps not a few naturally devout souls, been led by the bewildering choice of creeds in modern England to the extreme undenominationalism of the rejection of all. None of those he had tried had satisfied him completely: the weak note, the lack in all had been precisely that for which his soul yearned most hungrily: the fitting and seemingly worship of God. It had seemed to him the concentration on human need even in prayer, heavily weighted with petition, had wronged and forgotten the claims of the Divine.

The prospect therefore of a new religion, possessing this wonderful characteristic of Adoration carried to its fullest height, was a promise of the satisfaction of his own reverential instinct for the due and fitting. The words which to his neighbours would perhaps have been devoid of meaning attracted him with the force of a magnet. No form of religion with which he was acquainted had attempted this, indeed he had not known that such an aspiration existed upon earth and he was excited by his discovery.

Yet the fragmentary condition of his source of information frustrated the gaining of further knowledge. Who were the folk blessed with so exquisite a privilege? What, too, was "Continual Exposition," the *Blessed* Sacrament, and whence the need of candles?

He pondered the mystery at intervals throughout the evening, and at length an inspiration came to him. He would discover from the loquacious boy when next he came to the shop what religion the new owner of the big house professed. He rather suspected it would turn out to be some Eastern, esoteric creed.

Then he relapsed into meditation. Perpetual! It was going on then as he went to bed, nor would it cease while he slept.

He was at work early the next morning still hypnotized by his consciousness of a new and secret knowledge. It did not prevent, however, the giving of his full attention to the jug awaiting its turn: a case, he saw, for "bridge" work, the greater part of its handle being missing. He bored a small hole in each of the two remaining stumps, into which he inserted and cemented a bit of copper wire to form a core. Then he put that aside and turned to the rivetting of the plates from the big house, laying the broken pieces edge to edge and marking on each side dots where the holes would be drilled. His thoughts kept feast as he bent and flattened the wire for the rivet, and he had just touched its ends with shellac before insertion when the shop bell rang. That did not matter: the wire would contract and cool now, so bringing the edges of the fracture together.

On his return he made some patching mixtures; one for the handle of the jug and another of plumbago, brick-dust and waterglass for the filling of a tiny hole in a black Wedgewood vase.

At intervals he was absent in the spirit, for though he did

not recognize it himself he really lived two lives: one of the faithful healer of old china and another that of a soul capable of becoming *Gott-betrunken*. His outer life showed a regularity almost machine-like yet removed altogether from the commonplace by the glints shed thereon from the divine fire within his soul.

A week later exhilaration possessed him at the prospect of light to be shed upon the words still haunting him. With the gladness of them still in his heart he answered the first ring of the shop bell.

The boy from the big house stood there.

"Come for the plates," he announced without preamble, and Mr. Jameson, nodding, returned to his bench to fetch them. While securing an extra string round the parcel as he stood in the shop he sprang a question on the boy.

"What religion are the new folk up at the house?" he asked, feeling that his life hung on the answer.

"Why, everyone in the village knows as they be Catholics, in course," the urchin returned, not troubling to veil his contempt of Mr. Jameson's despicable ignorance. "Got their own chapel they 'as, stuck full o' all sorts of things," and putting down the china pig he had been fingering he prepared to depart.

"What sort?" faltered John Jameson. His heart had sunk like lead at the boy's reply. All his hopes of a modern, enlightened sect were killed. Romanists! Papists! Who did not even worship God at all but the Virgin Mary instead. He remembered a chapel sermon once heard against Mariolatry. There must be some mistake: the paper could not have to do with that religion.

"Oh, pictures and figures of folk, and candles, lots of 'em. My eye, but it's fine when they're all ablaze!" he added appreciatively.

But at every word the boy had spoken Mr. Jameson's heart sank lower. Yet there were the candles, mysteriously connected in some way with the Adoration.

"Seems as though the aristocracy should know better," he remarked as he handed the parcel to the boy. "I'm not particular where I worship but I *do* draw the line at Catholics." Mr. Jameson was not of the self-righteous, but his tone savoured of it now.

Before the boy escaped, however, he brought the fragment of cherished newspaper from his pocket. Anything was better than suspense.

"Do you know from what paper this came?" he asked, extending the creased page.

"Why, *Catholic Times*, as they takes every week reg'lar," was the answer. "If you wants to know all about it you should come to the chapel. It's open all nights as well as Sunday."

The china-dealer was, however, too sad for such frivolous amusement. He was thrown back upon himself, and the fellowship of "Perpetual Adoration" had dissolved into thin air.

The next week was a rainy one and but few jobs came in. Customers also were rare, and affairs reached a crisis on a dull day upon which he sold only a breakfast saucer for three halfpence and a teapot for sixpence all day long.

Tiring towards dusk of his cramped position at the bench he rose and went into the shop to satisfy among the gaudy and crude ware a hunger for beauty.

In the half light, however, some of his goods pleased him. They were better thus not seen too plainly. There were cheap vases whose curves were yet quite graceful, and he began massing such stuff as possessed colour together. He would make himself a pleasure corner: as no one served in the shop except himself the disarrangement would be of no consequence. All florid and decorated articles he rejected, choosing only those of plain character. The childish make-believe recalled his last visit to the Museum at Kensington, and he lost himself for a while in a dream of the magic beauty of oriental porcelain: of the purity of azure blue, of the old Chinese vivid red and of the chameleon-like range of aubergine.

Then suddenly the chasm between the old classics of pottery and the contents of a modern china shop sickened him, and he could find his recreation there no longer. He must go out.

The old craving, too, for communion with God was upon him. Often at night he had been able to satisfy it in quiet places beneath a starlit sky, but this evening the rain deprived him of his natural temple. Not a place of worship in the village would be open. It was not a prayer-meeting night. The only shelter offered was the Romanist chapel. The boy had said it was never closed any day till 8 p.m.

Yet he hesitated still, after he had closed the shop door behind him, till a fresh downpour drove him thither at

a brisk trot. He would explore this religion of extremes: of degrading superstitions, and, if so be, of "Perpetual Adoration."

He caught a gleam of faint light within the chapel as he approached, yet when he stepped inside it was nearly dark. That, however, gave him courage. No one would notice his entry, though when his eyes grew accustomed to the gloom he detected a few figures kneeling. It flashed upon him, as he watched, that they knelt in Adoration.

He let himself go then, and without giving heed to his surroundings, which nevertheless rested him strangely, buried his face in his hands and immediately, it seemed to himself, found God.

He wondered, as the noise of folk entering roused him, why he should have done so more speedily and more easily than ever before, and again the answer was given him. God was here.

Two children slid into a seat beside him, and during the bewildering quarter of an hour that followed he watched them for guidance. When a bell rang he heard the elder whisper, "Bend down your head," and John Jameson did likewise.

It was over now and the worshippers were dispersing, but he remained kneeling till his acquaintance, the boy, roused him.

Once outside the chapel Mr. Jameson tried to shake himself free from its influences. The transition to ordinary life was besides aided by his companion who, on his way to the village, hung in the old man's wake.

"See the Crucifix life-size, just like a real dead 'un?" he inquired.

"No," the shopkeeper replied, somewhat at a loss to explain his abstraction to his tormentor. "It was too dark for me to see anything."

"Well, I likes that! With the candles ablazin' like fireworks, a precious deal lighter nor daylight. You must have seen the Lady in blue just above you?"

"I tell you I saw nothing," Mr. Jameson repeated, "and you'd better say nothing of my being there to the folk in the village. They might think it strangelike."

"Well, as for myself, I goes often," the boy returned. "I likes the lights you see, and the images is company even when the chapel's empty."

John Jameson, however, blamed himself for his indul-

gence. There was something almost uncanny, he decided, in its attractiveness, and he would go no more. Besides, there was nothing to prove that the chapel and Perpetual Adoration were in any way connected.

So he absorbed himself on the morrow in his work, punctuated as usual by the ringing of the bell.

His very first visitor was the boy, on private business connected with objects of domestic use for his own home, and while he selected his wares he talked.

"Heard the news?" he asked, with the air of a man of the world that always made Mr. Jameson feel behind the times. "The owner's not a-comin' into the big house at all. It's to be turned into a nunnery."

"Then the chapel will be shut up?" the shopman said with a curious sinking at the heart, though he had, of course, meant never to enter it again.

"That it won't," the boy returned scornfully. "Where'd the folk go for Mass d'ye suppose? Cook says as there'll be a grille put up. The part you was in 'ull still be for the public."

"What will they do in the nunnery?" Mr. Jameson asked, curious in spite of himself.

"Oh, they're Perpetual Adoration," the boy said, counting out his coppers. "You'll see 'em at it if you likes to go," and with this last piece of information he departed. Which was as well, as Mr. Jameson would have been incapable of further conversation.

He was dumbfounded and stunned. Perpetual Adoration not only somewhere in the world but here, close at hand, in the village itself!

It was some weeks later that Mr. Jameson crept once again into the chapel. Behind the grille two white veiled figures knelt before the altar, and with a great leap of the heart he knew that here were two of the profession of Perpetual Adoration, and humbly in his own portion of the chapel John Jameson vowed himself to participate as far as might be possible in their rivalry of the angels.

"The most uncontroversial conversion I have ever known," the priest who received John Jameson into the Church asserted, "traceable, as far as I can make out, to something read on a newspaper wrapping."

EVELINE COLE.

THE FEAST OF THE ASSUMPTION

NON-CATHOLIC writers who have occasion to deal with the history of what they commonly call "Mariolatry" evince a curious reluctance to accept evidence for the early development of devotion to our Lady. No doubt the exaggerations of certain over-zealous apologists, who assume that the manifestations of Christian piety must have taken the same form in the first as in the twentieth century, and that the Hail Mary, for instance, as we know it now, must have been recited in the time of the Apostles, are responsible in part for this attitude of mistrust. It is not altogether surprising that such ignorant and ill-judged advocacy should provoke a reaction. But on the other hand there is in many quarters an unmistakable dislike of anything so distinctively popish as the invocation in any form of the Mother of God and, as in the similar case of the veneration of relics and the recognition of papal authority, there is always a tendency to ignore the early appearance of those features which have been looked upon in later times as the shibboleths of Ultramontaniam.

Let me take as an example of what I here have in mind an important article in a work of reference which, as compared with the similar accounts provided in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* or in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, is by no means unsympathetic to the Catholic standpoint. Dr. James Cooper, writing in the most lately published volume of the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, has obviously no wish to underestimate the part which the cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary has played in the development of Catholic doctrine and practice. At the same time his treatment of the subject passes over many features of importance and gives, I am convinced, a quite inadequate impression of the strength of the movement in the early centuries. Not only does he tell us practically nothing of the rôle played by the Syrian Church in this process of evolution, but he is equally silent as to the evidence afforded, both in East and West, by the very significant data of church dedications. Moreover, when dealing with the question of the festivals of our Lady he leaves his readers under the impression that in the West no recognized Marian feast established itself before "the observance of the

Assumption was appointed by the Synod of Salzburg in A.D. 800." How very much this understates the true progress of the development I hope to show in the few pages which follow.

Probably the first striking fact to which we can appeal with confidence, a fact which has only become known through a discovery made by Dr. Rendel Harris within the last ten years, is the remarkable language used about the Blessed Virgin in the so-called *Odes of Solomon*. Whether this book, preserved to us only in a Syriac text, is of purely Jewish inspiration, as Dr. Harris at first supposed, or whether, as Dr. Bernard contends, it is not only Christian but orthodox, does not for our present purpose make very much difference. The important fact is that it cannot possibly be assigned to a later date than the year 180 A.D., while many scholars incline to the opinion that it belongs to the early years of the second century. None the less the 19th Ode contains a passage which it is impossible to interpret otherwise than as a direct allusion to the special privileges attached to the maternity of the Blessed Virgin, the Theotokos. It seems desirable to give the Ode entire, just as it stands in the translation published for the Cambridge *Texts and Studies* by Dr. Bernard:

A cup of milk was offered to me; and I drank it in the sweetness of the delight of the Lord. The Son is the cup and He who was milked is the Father; and the Holy Spirit milked Him because His breasts were full, and it did not seem good to Him that His milk should be spilt for nought; and the Holy Spirit opened Her¹ bosom and mingled the milk from the two breasts of the Father; and gave the mixture to the world without its knowing it, and they who receive it are the perfection of the right hand. The womb of the Virgin caught it and received conception and brought forth, and the Virgin became a Mother with many mercies;² and she travailed and brought forth a Son, without incurring pain. Because it happened not emptily, and she had not sought a midwife, (for He brought her to bear) she brought forth as it were a man by the will of God and she brought Him forth openly, and acquired Him in great power and loved Him in salvation, and guarded Him in kindness, and showed Him in Majesty. Hallelujah.³

¹ The Holy Spirit is spoken of as feminine in Syriac literature.

² Lactantius translates this clause "Infirmatus est uterus virginis et accepit fetum et gravata est et facta est in multa miseratione mater virgo," *Inst. Div.* IV, 12; "Et elle devint Mère-Vierge avec beaucoup de miséricorde," Batiffol.

³ J. H. Bernard (Anglican Bishop of Ossory), *The Odes of Solomon*, p. 86. Cf. Dom Connolly, O.S.B., in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XIII. (1912), pp. 298-309.

We have nothing but conjecture to guide us regarding the birthplace of this very remarkable document, and even the original language is a matter of uncertainty, though the majority of critics have pronounced strongly in favour of Greek. The point that strikes one as of exceptional interest is the recognition of the principle of privilege. The Blessed Mother, being what she was, and called to such high functions, was marked out, so the writer seems assured, to be the object of special and miraculous dispensations. We see something of this in the apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy (the *Protevangelium Jacobi*),¹ which also probably dates from the second century, but the idea is more strongly and concisely presented in the Ode just quoted. Probably we must not think of "the Mother of Mercy" *motif*, (the *Mater Misericordiæ*) at so early a date, even when we find Lactantius citing the passage in the form, "and she became in much mercy the Mother Virgin." Mary here is the recipient not the bestower of mercy, and the reference seems to be to the *κεχαριτωμένη* (full of grace) of the angelic salutation. But the very structure of the passage, which Batiffol has conjecturally translated back into Greek, sets in high relief the wonders accomplished through the Virgin Mother in the Incarnation:

She brought forth as it were a man by the will of God,
And she brought Him forth openly,
And acquired Him in great power,
And loved Him in salvation,²
And guarded Him in kindness,
And showed Him in Majesty.³

By a natural development of this idea of privilege the oriental mind came early to see that the Divine favour shown to the Lord's handmaiden would not be likely to stop short at the gift of sinlessness, or at the miraculous preservation of the seal of virginity, or at exemption from the pangs of childbirth. It is nothing less than extraordinary that in the endless Mariological discussions of both the friends and foes of Catholicism so little attention has been directed to the writings

¹ Chapters 19 and 20. Cf. also the *Ascension of Isaiah*, xi. 14, and the valuable work of J. Niessen, *Die Mariologie des h. Hieronymus*, 1913.

² Dr. Bernard suggests that this may be a reminiscence of "my spirit has rejoiced in God my Saviour," in the *Magnificat*.

³ Cf. 1 Tim. iii. 16.

of the Fathers of the early Syrian Church. Almost alone among non-Catholic critics the late Professor Ernst Lucius has recognized the true position of affairs.

Here also [he says] the Syrian St. Ephraem was the first to draw straightforwardly all those consequences which in his thought followed from the fact that God the All-highest had taken up His abode in a Virgin's womb. In his eyes not only had Mary become a royal city because the King had dwelt within her, not only had she become a Holy of holies because the High Priest had made His entry there, but in due regard of the fact that the fire of the Deity had filled her without consuming her bodily members, she had been transformed into a new being, a new creation. Since God had taken upon Himself the garb of a human mother, He had thereby also invested her with the mantle of His own glory.¹

This cannot, I think, be regarded as a notably exaggerated estimate of the glowing enthusiasm which marks the references of St. Ephraem to the prerogatives of the Mother of God. It must not of course be forgotten that the authenticity of many of the writings attributed to the great preacher of Edessa is not established beyond dispute. But restricting ourselves even to those which Professor Burkitt declares to be certainly genuine, we may say with Lucius that the spirit in which Mary's privileges were contemplated by the great ecclesiastics of the Syrian Church in the fourth century differs but little from the fervour of devotion which we find prevailing in western Europe during the middle ages.² Here, for example, is a specimen taken from St. Ephraem's metrical outpourings on the Nativity. The writer is endeavouring to portray the feelings with which Joseph and our Blessed Lady must have looked upon the newly-born Infant, as He lay in the manger:

Joseph caressed the Son as a babe, he ministered to Him as God . . . and he was awe-struck at Him as the Just One, greatly bewildered. "Who hath given to me the Son of the Most High to be a son to me? I was jealous of Thy Mother and I thought to put her away, and I knew not that in her womb was hidden a mighty treasure, that should suddenly enrich my poor estate.

.
With rival words did Mary wax hot, yea she lulled Him, saying: "Who hath given me, the barren, that I should conceive

¹ Lucius, *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults*, 1904, p. 442.

² Lucius, *Anfänge*, p. 517. It is true, however, that Lucius is here speaking primarily of the prayers to the Theotokos, known only in a Greek translation.

and bring forth this One that is manifold, a little one that is great; for that He is wholly with me and wholly everywhere. . . .

For my pure conception of Thee, wicked men have slandered me. Be, O Thou Holy One, a speaker for Thy Mother. Shew a miracle that they may be persuaded from Whom it is that I conceived Thee. For Thy sake too I am hated; Thou lover of all. Lo! I am persecuted who have conceived and brought forth one House of Refuge for men. Adam will rejoice for Thou art the Key of Paradise. Lo, the sea raged against Thy Mother as against Jonas. Lo, Herod, that raging wave, sought to drown the Lord of the seas. Whither I shall flee Thou shalt teach me, O Lord of Thy Mother. With Thee I will flee, that I may gain in Thee Life in every place. The prison with Thee is no prison, for in Thee man goeth up into Heaven; the grave with Thee is no grave, for Thou art the Resurrection."¹

The emphasis thus laid upon the idea of resurrection almost of itself suggests that there may have been germinating in St. Ephraem's mind the same fundamental thought which underlies the narrative of the *Transitus*, or *Dormitio Mariæ* ("the Falling asleep of Mary"). It is by no means improbable that this apocryphal document, attributed in most copies to the authorship of the Apostle St. John, may have already been in circulation in some less developed form before the end of the fourth century. At any rate when St. Ephraem in another of the same Nativity poems contrasts the history of Eve and of Mary, telling us of the former that she allowed the accursed serpent to enter and dwell within her, in such way that "his evil counsel became bread to her that she might become dust," he seems at the same time to contrast with this the effect of the indwelling of Christ who is "the garment of glory" for Mary and all the world.² But most of all does the idea of some translation and transformation of the body of the most holy Virgin seem to be suggested in the introductory words of the same poem:

The Babe that I carry carrieth me, saith Mary, and He hath lowered His wings, and taken and placed me between His pinions, and mounted into the air, and a promise has been given me that height and depth shall be my Son's.³

¹ Rhythms of St. Ephraem on the Nativity, No. 4.

² Similarly Bickell, *Carmina Nisibena* (pp. 28-29 and 122), quotes Ephraem as declaring that Jesus and His Mother are alone beautiful in all respects, "for in Thee, Lord, there is no spot, and in Thy Mother there is no sin."

³ Rhythm XII.

All this, of course, and much that might be added from other Syriac sources of slightly later date, does not necessarily imply the existence of an annually recurring festival in honour of the Blessed Virgin. But a stronger ground for expecting such a commemoration is undoubtedly involved in the fact that in the early part of the fifth century, if not earlier, important churches began to be dedicated to the blessed Mother of God. Sir William M. Ramsay, referring to the great Council which assembled at Ephesus (A.D. 431) "in the most holy church which is called Maria," remarks that the very existence of a church bearing such a name "is in itself proof that a strong idea of the divinity (sic) of the Virgin Mother of the Saviour had already fixed itself in the popular mind at Ephesus."

Sir William writes from his own point of view, and while his tone is by no means irreverent or scoffing, he believes that the exceptional development at Ephesus of devotion to the Theotokos is to be connected with the ancient pagan cult of the Ephesian Artemis. But was the manifestation of devotion at Ephesus so very exceptional? Less than ten years after the Council we find Pope Xystus III. in Rome itself dedicating the Liberian basilica to the Blessed Virgin Mary. The inscription is still preserved, beginning—

Virgo Maria tibi Xystus nova templa dicavi.

Moreover the very sermon of Proclus, Bishop of Cyzicus, to which Sir W. M. Ramsay appeals in evidence of the cult prevailing in 431 is not strictly speaking an Ephesian document. It was indeed prefixed as a sort of introduction to the Acts of the Council, but the discourse itself was apparently preached two years before in Constantinople. The ardour of the language used leaves nothing to be desired, and we have, amongst other passages, a metaphor elaborately worked out, describing Mary as "the awful loom of the Incarnation, by which in some unspeakable way the garment of that union was woven, whereof the weaver is the Holy Ghost, and the spinner the overshadowing from on high; the wool the ancient fleece of Adam; the woof the undefiled flesh of the Virgin, the weaver's shuttle the immense grace of Him who brought it about; the artificer the Word gliding through the hearing."¹ Sir William emphasizes the points in the sermon which make

¹ Migne, P.G., LXV., 681

for his argument, but his account does not misrepresent the facts:

The subject of the sermon is "celebrating the glorification of the race of women"; it is "the glory of the female,"¹ due to her "who was in due time Mother and Virgin," "Earth and Sea do honour to the Virgin." "Let Nature skip in exultation; women are honoured. Let Humanity dance in chorus; Virgins are glorified. The sacred Mother of God, Mary, has brought us here together." She is called in terms hardly distinguishable from the language of paganism, "the fleece very pure, moist from the rain of heaven, through whose agency the Shepherd put on Him the gown and nature of the sheep, she who is slave and mother, virgin and heaven, the sole bridge by which God passes to men."

It seems [Sir William continues] impossible to mistake or to deny the meaning implied in this language. The Anatolian religious feeling desiderated some more clear and definite expression of an idea dear to it beyond the expression which was otherwise contained in the rites and language of Christianity. That idea was the honour, the influence, the inevitableness in the world, of the female element in its double aspect of purity and motherhood.²

But what is more particularly worthy of attention in this discourse of Bishop Proclus is the opening sentence: "The Virgin's festival (παρθενική πανήγυρις) incites our tongue today to herald her praise." Both in classical Greek and in the liturgical language of more modern times,³ πανήγυρις means, as Liddell and Scott translate it, "high festival." It seems clear, then, that at Constantinople already in 429 our Blessed Lady had a feast kept with solemnity. Moreover, this very fact cannot but lend probability to the contention of Dr. Baumstark that in 370, more than fifty years earlier, at Antioch a celebration was observed which was known as "the commemoration of the ever-virgin Mary, Mother of God" (μνήμη τῆς ἁγίας Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας).⁴ Of course we do not know that these celebrations were identified with any tradition as to the bodily assumption of Mary into heaven; but it must also be remembered that from the very beginning the day of a martyr's death was honoured as his

¹ Τοῦ γένους τῶν γυναικῶν καύχημα τὸ τελούμενον, and δόξα τοῦ Θήλεος.

² Sir W. M. Ramsay, *Pauline and other Studies*, p. 134.

³ See L. Clugnet, *Dictionnaire des noms liturgiques*—"πανήγυρις jour de fête solennelle—festivitas, solemnitas."

⁴ See the *Römische Quartalschrift*, 1897, p. 55.

"birthday," the day, that is, of his entrance into glory. Consequently if any one occasion in the year were selected to honour the memory of the most holy Virgin, the natural instinct would be to regard this celebration as the anniversary of her removal to a better world, whether the event itself was described as *transitus* (passage) or *dormitio* (falling asleep) or *assumptio* (assumption) or *natalis* (birth day)—all which words were, in fact, used in connection with this solemnity in the Latin of the early middle ages. That this diversity of designations led to a certain amount of confusion, at any rate in the Western Church, we shall have occasion to see directly. From one of the more recently deciphered papyri of Oxyrhynchus,¹ though the text is unfortunately imperfect, we learn some interesting details regarding the ecclesiastical worship in that Egyptian city during the year 536. We discover, for example, that there was a system of "stations" in force, regulating the meetings of the faithful for public worship (*συνάξεις*), working apparently very much upon the same lines as the stations in Rome. The station for three successive days at Christmas-tide was appointed to be "at St. Mary's" (*εἰς τὴν Ἀγίαν Μαρτίαν*). This must obviously have been one of the greater and probably one of the more venerable churches of the city. If so it was no doubt one of the churches (of which he tells us that there are twelve, "in which the public assemblies of the faithful were held") visited in A.D. 410 by Rufinus. Furthermore, it seems clear, though the record is imperfect, that in 536 a festival of the Blessed Virgin was celebrated on the 21st of the month Tubi, corresponding to the 16th or 17th of January. This is the more interesting because St. Gregory of Tours, writing about 580 A.D., tells us that in the Gaul of his day a great feast was kept in Mary's honour "in the middle of the eleventh month" (*i.e.*, January). As this is mentioned in almost immediate connection with a reference to her bodily assumption, there can be little doubt that the festival was associated in his mind with the commemoration of her departure from this world.² There is abundant other evidence regarding this January festival of the Assumption, at any rate in Gaul, during the seventh century, and Dom Germain Morin has even found a sermon inserted by St. Cæsarius of Arles between the Epiphany and

¹ See Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, No. 1357. Vol. XI. p. 33.

² See Greg. Turon, *De Gloria Martyrum*, I. chaps. 9 and 4. Migne, P.L., LXXI. p. 713, and in the *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*.

the 25th of January, and rubricated *Omelia de X Virginibus quæ in festivitate S. Mariæ dici potest*.¹ This would take the western festival back to somewhere about the year 540 at latest. Of the existence of this Assumption feast in January—often indicated, as in the Bobbio Missal, under that precise name²—there is abundant evidence at a somewhat later date, but I do not propose to pursue the subject here.

We have now reached, and indeed over-passed, the period at which there took shape that detailed narrative of the "Falling asleep of Mary" which, in a multitude of varying forms, became so highly popular throughout the middle ages. That in some of its recensions it cannot be later than the early years of the sixth century is proved by the entry "liber qui appellatur Transitus sanctæ Mariæ" (the book which is called the Passing of holy Mary) among the apocryphal books proscribed by the so-called Decretum Gelasianum.³ But it also seems certain that, even in its fullest and most extravagant developments, the *Transitus* must be older than the middle of the sixth century. The Syriac codex from which Dr. Wright printed his text in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, 1865, is considered by him to have been written between 550 and 600, but the palimpsest which Mrs. Smith Lewis has edited in *Studia Sinaitica*, Vol. XI., is still older, although it represents a longer and more developed revision. Both texts, however, plainly assume the recognition in the ecclesiastical calendar of three great feasts of the Blessed Virgin. Of these one was on the 15th day of Iyar (roughly corresponding to May) "on account of the seeds that were sown and on account of the abundance of the harvest." For this it does not seem possible to suggest any western parallel. Another, "on account of the vines bearing clusters" says the *Transitus*, was on the 13th day of Ab (*i.e.*, August).⁴ This is pretty

¹ Morin in *Revue Bénédictine*, 1888, p. 344.

² Sometimes also, as in certain codices of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, as *depositio* or *transitus*.

³ See von Dobschütz on the Decretum Gelasianum in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 3rd Series VIII., 4, pp. 12, 303—304. The date of the Decretum must be, according to Dobschütz, between 494 and 523; but cf. also Dom John Chapman in *Revue Bénédictine*, 1913.

⁴ There is much to suggest that these dates were timed to fit in with some kind of Nature festival existing from time immemorial, but the very fact that they have been connected by different writers with celebrations in honour of Dionysus, Artemis and Astarte, shows that the whole system of identification is pure guess-work and is quite unreliable.

clearly identified with our present feast of mid-August. The third festival was in the winter season, and it is curious to notice that while both describe the commemoration as being observed two days after the Nativity of our Lord, Dr. Wright's Text assumes that the Nativity was kept on what corresponds to December 25th, while Mrs. Smith Lewis's follows the older eastern arrangement which identified the birth of our Saviour with January 6th, our feast of the Epiphany. According to the fanciful story of the *Transitus* our Lady died on the same day as that on which our Lord was born, but

because on the day that she bore Him she passed out of this world, and because it was not possible to have a commemoration on her "birth day" (*i.e.*, the *natale* or entry into heaven) we command [it is the Apostles who are speaking] that after two days there shall be a commemoration of the Blessed One, that there may be help from her to men and by means of her offerings and her prayers the fruits of the earth may be blessed.¹

This winter festival, then, which our apocryphal document describes as occurring "mid snow and ice which gladdens the earth,"² was really the true Assumption feast, but even in Syria itself in the sixth century there seems to have been a diversity of practice. In some places it was kept on the 27th day of the first Kanun, ostensibly corresponding to December 27th, in others on the 8th day of the second Kanun (*i.e.*, January 8th). Now if we suppose, as we have justification for doing, that it was in this part of the world, that the enthusiastic cult shown to Mary the Mother of God, perpetuated itself in the general observance of an annual feast, it becomes easy to understand how this commemoration, when adopted in the west, was assigned to many different days. The Syrian months did not coincide either with those of Egypt or those of Greece or those of the Julian calendar. The dates observed by the Syrian Church had therefore to be translated, so to speak, into the terms of other reckonings. In some cases it was found convenient to ignore these differences. The compiler of *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, for example, has simply taken the Syriac calendar which he had before him and has assumed that the month Ab coincided with August, the month Iyar with May, and so on. But they did not really coincide. A feast kept in Syria on the 5th of Ab fell several

¹ *Studia Sinaitica*, XI. p. 59.

² *Journal of Sacred Literature*. Ap. 1865, p. 154.

days earlier than the same feast if kept in the west on the 5th of August. Further, the position was complicated by the fact that many celebrations travelled westward *via* Egypt, where again a different system of months prevailed. Egypt was so close to Syria that communication between the Churches was easy and frequent. There seems consequently to have been an attempt to celebrate the great festivals in the two countries on the same actual day, regardless of any conformity in the numbering. On the other hand the Egyptian system of months agreed even less well than that of Syria with the arrangement in the west. There is, therefore, no reason for surprise if we find the winter feast of the Blessed Virgin appearing in Spain on December 18th and in Gaul on January 18th, and again in some special calendars on December 27th. Without pretending to offer any real solution in a matter in which all speculation is mere groping in the dark, there is at least a possibility that the Syrian feast had in some way come to be kept in Egypt on the 18th Tubi,¹ and that in transporting the celebration to Western Europe the Spanish Church had chosen to identify Tubi with December, the Gauls with January. It seems to me also a curious coincidence that in certain martyrologies and calendars, the feast of St. John the Apostle, kept, as now, on December 27th, should appear under the heading "*Assumptio S. Johannis*." Can it be that St. John, so closely connected with the Blessed Virgin in the apocryphal story of the *Transitus*, was at some early period associated with her in the festival, and that the word "*assumptio*" strictly speaking belongs only to Mary's share in the feast? It must be sufficient to propound these queries without attempting to answer them. What is certain is that long before the year 800, when formal legislation imposed the festival upon ecclesiastical observance throughout the wide dominions of Charlemagne, a solemn commemoration in our Lady's honour was kept nearly everywhere. For a long time it seemed uncertain whether the winter feast or that in August would acquire the greater prominence. In the Epternach martyrologium and in the calendar of St. Willibald we find clear traces of both. Both seemingly, as making a claim to be regarded as *the* festival of the Blessed Virgin, professed to do honour to her (heavenly) "birth day," the day of her departure from the world. Such, as I noted

¹ Or possibly the 18th Choiak.

above, was the custom in the case of the martyrs and other saints. The winter festival, according to the apocryphal *Transitus*, professed to mark as nearly as might be the actual day of her death. The August celebration occurring at a period of the year when the calendar was unembarrassed and the weather conditions favourable, lent itself to greater solemnity of observance. In many of the earlier references to it, it appears as *natale* or *nativitas*, *i.e.*, the (heavenly) "birth day." Let me take as an illustration, not because it is particularly early but because it is a British example, the verse of St. Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, written as Ehwald considers about A.D. 690:

Istam nempe diem, qua templi festa coruscant
Nativitate sua sacrauit Virgo Maria,
Quam iugiter renovant Augusti tempora mensis
Dividitur medio dum torrens sextilis orbe;
Qui nobis iterum restaurat gaudia mentis,
Dum vicibus redeunt solemnia festa Mariæ
Et veneranda piis flagrant altaria donis.¹

Which Bishop G. F. Browne translates—

For this great day on which the Church's festival shines forth, the Virgin Mary has hallowed by her nativity; which the times of August renew each year when the burning sextile month is divided in mid orb; bringing renewed gladness to our mind, when in its turn the solemn feast of Mary recurs and the sacred altars blaze with pious gifts.

Both Bishop Browne and Ehwald make a difficulty over the supposed assignment of the "Nativity" of Mary to mid-August. But there can be little doubt that Aldhelm did not mean the word *nativitatis* to be emphasized. It fitted into his hexameter line (though even then at the cost of a false quantity), but it was no more than the equivalent of the more usual *natale* or "birth day." The earliest known testimony to the celebration of the August feast of our Lady in Rome, *i.e.*, the *Comes* of Würzburg, describes it, not as "Assumptio," but simply by the abbreviation NT.=*natale*,² which, as Dom Morin remarks, implies that it was then the principal,³

¹ Ehwald, *Aldelmi Opera* (M.G.H. Auct. Antiquiss. Tom. XV. 1913), p. 17.

² "Die XV men. aug; nt. scæ. Mariæ" See Morin in *Revue Bénédictine*, 1917, p. 313.

³ The entry *natale sanctæ Mariæ* seems, however, to be used for lesser commemorations, see *Rev. Bén.* 1912, p. 429, note 2.

if not the only, festival of the Blessed Virgin. The ecclesiastical order which this *Comes* represents belongs, as the same high authority has proved, to about the year 650 A.D. Again the erasure which is found before the words *S. Mariæ* on August 16th in the calendar of S. Willibrord may very well cover some reading NAT. or NT., which, when the festival became commonly known as the "Assumption," was judged to be misleading. In the Irish Martyrology of Cengus (c. 804 A.D.) "the nativity of Mary" (*gein Maire*) figures as in St. Willibrord's calendar, on August 16th.¹ But, as in *gein Pilipp* on May 1st and *gein Tomais* on May 30th, this probably represents no more than the ordinary *natale* or birth day.

Without, then, troubling ourselves too much about the precise designation used, for this is a subordinate point, it is tolerably clear that, even before the Emperor Maurice (582—602) enjoined the celebration of our Lady's Assumption in the East on August 15th, some festival of the same kind was gradually winning acceptance in western lands such as Gaul, Spain, Italy, and Britain. St. Gregory of Tours, who died in 593, is quite explicit, as we have seen, about the sacred festival of Mary kept "in the middle of the eleventh month," *i.e.*, January. He also mentions many churches dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and it is hardly possible to imagine the existence of such dedications without the celebration of some festival to do honour to so illustrious a patron. In Spain we have epigraphic evidence of the consecration of a church, dedicated to Mary, under King Reccaredus in 587, and of another still earlier in 556.² In Rome, as already noticed, such dedications occur even in the fifth century. But confining ourselves to the evidence for the liturgical Gallic celebration in January, we can appeal in the Lectionary of Luxeuil to a mention of the "Festivitas S. Mariæ," and in MS. Lat. 256 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, to a gospel for the "fifth Sunday after the Assumption of St. Mary." In both cases the feast referred to must have occurred in winter and before Lent, and the manuscripts themselves, written in the seventh century, describe the practice of the influential Church of Paris

¹ But under Aug. 15th Cengus also has the entry "On the great feast of her commemoration, very Mother of our Father, with a host of kings, right splendid assembly." Stokes, *Martyrology of Cengus* (H. Bradshaw Society), p. 176.

² See Hübner, *Inscriptiones Hispania Christiana*, Nos. 155 and 357.

at that date.¹ Furthermore, as Dom Cabrol² and Father Fita have pointed out, an inscription at Valognes near Cherbourg proves that a feast of our Lady in the middle of August was known and celebrated in some parts even of Gaul itself as early as the year 670.³ Upon the numerous testimonies establishing the rapid extension of this custom during the eighth century I have not space here to touch, but enough has been said to make it clear that the observance of this celebration in the West is of much greater antiquity than the time of Charlemagne.

Finally, let me emphasize the fact, as it is a point of some importance, that in the earliest records of our Lady's great festival, no stress seems to be laid upon the manner of the Blessed Mother's departure from this world. It was just her commemoration, or memory, that was kept, and the festival was called by many various names—birth-day, falling-asleep, passing, etc. In other words, the occasion, as in the case of other saints, was identified with the day of her entry into Heaven, but the manner of her departure was regarded as in itself a point of secondary importance.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ Morin in *Revue Benedictine*, 1893, pp. 439—441.

² See Abbot Cabrol's admirable articles in the *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie*, I., p. 2995, and *Revue du Clergé français*, Vol. 63 (1910), pp. 385—397; Fita in *Boletín*, 1910, May. The inscription of the Bishop of Coutances had, however, previously been cited by Lucius, *Anfänge des Heiligenkults*, p. 488, n. 8.

³ Correcting obvious faults due to the lapidary, the text of this inscription runs: Constantiniensis urbis rector, Dominus Frodomundus pontifex, in honorem almæ Mariæ, Genetricis Domini, hoc templum, hocque altare, contruxit fideliter atque digne dedicavit, mense Augusto medio, et hic festus celebratus dies sit per annos singulos. (Le Blant, *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule*, I. no. 91.) The diocese mentioned is that of Coutances.

THE SONNAMBULISTA

“**N**O, Carluccia,” declared Sholto Maxwell, “I would far rather you didn’t see me off.”

“But I wish to! It was a settled arrangement with me. I should have thought you would *like* to see the very last of me—to see me up to the last moment possible.”

Carluccia’s tone was petulant, obstinate, and hurt. He certainly did not wish to hurt her. Probably nine people out of ten would have said that Sholto Maxwell was singularly fortunate in his engagement, that he had much the best of the bargain. Carluccia was a beauty, acknowledged as such everywhere (everywhere, that is to say, in society, and she herself knew no other opinion): she had considerable “distinction”: she was well born: she sang well, and painted much better. Sholto Maxwell was also well born: but he was only a subaltern of the new Army; he was not handsome, though of a stalwart, fine figure; he was not quite of the same social ring as Miss de Bolèsme—was not, indeed, of any social importance; and no one considered him brilliant. He was merely reliable and solid: with good brains, and excellent common sense. Of fortune he had a sufficiency, but no more.

Their engagement was a very sudden business. He had only known her three weeks when he asked her to say she would be his wife. She said Yes at once; and she was, indeed, altogether in love with him.

Sir Eustace de Bolèsme had held a diplomatic appointment in Italy, and had married a Roman lady of high rank. Lady de Bolèsme was now a widow, and spent half her time in England, half in Rome: but since the war began had not left London. Her daughter’s name was Carola, but Carluccia was her mother’s pet-name for her, and now everybody who knew her well called her by it.

Carluccia’s beauty was very southern: she was extraordinarily dark, and perhaps too pale, but her features were faultless and her eyes very large, brilliant, and expressive.

Her father had always spoiled her, and she was her mother’s mistress: Lady de Bolèsme was an ex-beauty, with very few ideas, but those few eminently correct.

Carluccia was all ideas—she was a prey to them, and they were always changing. She entirely forgave Sholto for having, as she thought, none at all. Her father had been like that, and she had sincerely loved him.

Sholto Maxwell might well be proud of the beauty and distinction of his future wife, and of her intense devotion to him: but she would be pretty sure to give him trouble. She was petulant, unreasonable, as obstinate as a mule, and fiercely jealous.

"I *intend* to go down to Dover to see you off," she announced obstinately. "Your sister is going."

"Elspeth is going over to nurse in a base-hospital. She cannot bring you back."

"That doesn't matter. Mamma can come too."

"She told me she was quite unfit for it."

"All right. Let her stay at home. I shall go. I have a special reason."

He smiled, and said that the most special reason was to see the last of him: but she had another which she did not tell him.

Finally she got her point, as she had always intended.

"There's another thing," she said presently. "I want you to come with me—this afternoon—to Elsa Nerida. I telegraphed for an appointment, and she has given me one. I will go and get ready now."

"Who is Elsa Nerida?"

"Don't you know? She is the greatest living sonnambulista, clairvoyante as they call it here."

"Carluccia, I *wish* you would not go near those people. I *beg* you not to go to her."

"I am certainly going. If you choose, on your last afternoon, to leave me, you can: only I shall go alone."

Sholto loathed the whole idea of clairvoyantes, and hated going near such a woman: it was quite against his conscience to take Carluccia to her.

"Will you go if I earnestly beg you to give it up?" he asked gently.

"I will not give it up. With you or without you I shall go. It was Elsa Nerida who told me I should meet you. She described you, and said you were coming into my life. The moment we met I recognized you 'il maestro della mia vita,' the Master of my life. You ought to be grateful to her."

"The master of your life," said Sholto with a little smile of protest, "and you will not do anything I ask!"

"Everything you ask. But this you must not ask: come—or let me go by myself."

It was Elsa Nerida who had described to her the sailing of a ship full of soldiers, from a haven under white cliffs with a castle on their summit, had described herself, Carluccia (very accurately), watching the ship go.

Elsa Nerida received her clients in a flat not far from Piccadilly. The door was opened by an elderly woman with a blank face, who did not admit them till Carluccia had handed her the telegram from her mistress giving an appointment. She then led them into a tiny waiting-room, a little like that of a fifth-rate dentist. After two or three minutes a door opened and a young man's face appeared in the doorway: the face of someone quite well known to Carluccia.

"No," said a voice beyond him, "not that door now."

The young man immediately closed the door, another was heard to open, leading evidently to the narrow hall or passage: then the entrance-door was opened and no doubt the blank-faced woman let him out.

"That," whispered Carluccia, "was Steenie Lackland. I can't abide him."

So far as could be seen in the moment he had stood at the door, he was a man of about Sholto's age, and of the same build and height, with fair hair like his, and blue-grey eyes like his: but with no other resemblance whatever.

"Adesso, Signorina," said the blank-faced woman, coming in. "Tutti due?"

"Tutti due."

"Allora." And the woman crossed to the window, pulled down a black blind and drew thick black curtains completely across.

"That," said Carluccia, in a low voice, "is lest Elsa Nerida should see you even during the moment the door is open. Take my hand. I will lead you."

"I hate it."

"Hate taking my hand!"

"The whole thing. I wish you would come away."

"I certainly shall *not*. Come, or I shall leave you."

She took him by the arm and piloted him to the door in which the other young man had shown for a moment. Their

footsteps were quite noiseless on the thick felt floor-covering. The doorway was broad and low.

"Stoop," said Carluccia. And they passed through together. Then the door closed behind them.

They were in pitch darkness. The place had a queer eastern smell, and was almost airless.

"There are two of you," said a very tired voice. "I gave leave only for one."

It was true that in her telegram Carluccia had made no mention of Sholto, but she had previously promised to bring him.

"One of us," said he, "is here very unwillingly."

"Then why do you come?"

"To please someone else. In this I am wrong to please her."

"You had better go." And the voice was full of anger.

"If you do I shall not forgive you," whispered Carluccia in his ear.

He was quite resolved not to leave her in that horrible place alone. He felt it to be simply horrible—the darkness was full of a hateful Presence, weird, ghastly, abominable.

"If he is afraid, let him go," said the voice: it was intensely displeased and scornful.

"Of course I am not afraid."

"I never asked you here," said the voice, "but I know you, though I never saw you."

She then described him—not flatteringly: the description, however, answered. Perhaps it might have served nearly as well for the other young man who had just gone out.

"Now," said the voice when the description was finished, "I wish you to see that there is nothing here. I wished to describe you before I had seen you."

Immediately a light—an ordinary electric light bulb—pendant from the ceiling was turned on, and the room and its occupants became visible. Everything was black: ceiling, walls, floor, furniture. The walls were not covered with curtains but painted or papered black: so was the ceiling. The furniture consisted of two settees, covered with black cloth, having black wooden legs, and a black tripod of iron holding a black metal bowl containing a few lumps of charcoal. Apparently there was no window: the doors into the hall and into the waiting-room were black, with dulled black handles. The covering of the floor appeared to be of what is called

"cork-lino," but black. Elsa Nerida was very tall, and her face was quite colourless. Her black robe reached up almost to her chin, but it was not long; her stockings must have been black, for against the black floor they did not appear at all, and her feet could not be seen, either, in their black felt slippers. Even with the electric light turned fully on, only the woman's face and hands showed, on account of the blackness of her clothing, the floor and walls.

"Sit down there," she said, pointing a long finger to one of the settees. On the finger was a queer ring of black iron, like a tiny cage, in which was a bit of cord—part of the strand of a halter with which a famous murderer had been hanged: but of that Sholto knew nothing.

The moment he and Carluccia had sat down the electric light went out. An instant later the charcoal in the bowl of the tripod glowed a dull red, and a very slight blue flame wavered up from it. There was a queer smell, not nasty but faint and sickly.

Elsa Nerida was quite invisible. Sholto concluded she had merely turned her back.

"Of course she is there," he thought.

"Certainly I am," she said scornfully.

But almost instantly the electric light shone out again, and there appeared no sign of her. Still it seemed to him that against all that black background were she but to cower in a corner, with her face averted and hands hidden, she would not be visible.

"Go and search for her," Carluccia whispered.

He did so, walking quite round the walls: but he did not find her. She was not there.

As soon as he returned to his place beside Carluccia the electric light went out. He sat down and Carluccia took his hand in hers, laying her other hand upon it.

"Do believe," she whispered eagerly.

At that moment something touched him on the cheek; it felt like the skin of a mouse, and it somehow disgusted him. He jumped up angrily, and Elsa Nerida's voice said quietly from the other side of the room:

"I am here."

He turned sharply and saw her face low down near the floor. It disappeared and a moment later he saw it again, quite high up in the air, four or five feet from where it had been. It disappeared and reappeared—it seemed to be

everywhere. But there were no eyes in the face, nor any eyebrows. It was all a white blank.

This lasted perhaps for two minutes.

Then Elsa's face showed above the tripod, and her great, sombre black eyes were bent on the wavering blue flame.

"Ask what you want to know," she commanded.

"I want to know nothing."

"It is a pity you are inimical. Your spirit is not. It is only your temper. If I were a common medium I should say that your opposition of will balked the vision. Nothing can balk it. I will tell you what will be."

"You shall tell me nothing," said Sholto, not only with decision but with a certain anger that was distinctly perceptible in his voice. "I will listen to nothing that you may choose to say. Carluccia, I shall not stay here, nor do I intend to leave you here."

He had risen and was standing with his back to the Sonnambulista, turned to Carluccia, whose face was only barely visible, for the little flame in the tripod now gave a very faint glimmer.

Her eyes glittered, and she was trembling.

"Come, dear Carluccia," he asked her earnestly, but quite gently. In speaking to her there was no angry inflection in his voice.

Nevertheless she knew he was angry, though not yet, at all events, with her: she was afraid—afraid of losing him: she loved him with a strong though recent passion, and the dread of losing him frightened her. If she had been quite sure of keeping him, in spite of disobedience, she would have disobeyed.

While he bent towards her, pleadingly, something crept against his cheek: it felt like another cheek, very hot and dry. But though he started up at once, and threw up his hand, there was nothing: as soon as he had turned round he saw Elsa Nerida's face wavering in the air, rocking, as it were, to and fro, but several feet away.

"Go with him," said her voice; "I am tired of him! Obey him this time. Another time you will disobey him, and it will cost the fair man dear."

Carluccia stood up.

"I am coming," she said in a tired voice.

Almost instantly the electric light was turned on, and they found that they were alone in the room.

Outside in the street they got into a taxi. Carluccia was still afraid because his face was so grave and his mouth looked so hard and determined.

"I have lost caste with him," she thought, and again she trembled.

"Sholto," she asked gently, "are you angry?"

"Yes."

"With me?"

It was a pity she asked that second question: because his answer reassured her.

"No, of course not with you. With myself. I had no business to take you there. I knew I was wrong and ought not to have yielded."

"Then I should have gone alone. But I wanted her to say what would happen to you."

"Carluccia," he said, turning to her and taking her hand, "you must promise me that you will never go near that horrible place again."

"I can't promise," she said, truthfully enough, because her will was enfeebled by the hold she had allowed the Sonnambulista to gain over her.

"Then——"

And she thought he was going to declare that their engagement must end.

"Then," she said hurriedly, "I promise."

It was the first real lie she had ever told in her life. She was petulant, obstinate, and wayward, but her nature was frank and courageous, not the liar's nature: but the wretched influence to which she had wilfully subjected herself had corrupted her nature.

Her cheek reddened, for she knew she was lying: but he was not looking at her, and he thoroughly believed in her truth.

II.

For some time after his departure to France Carluccia did not go to see Elsa Nerida—because she did not yet want to go.

She had carried out her plan of seeing him off at Dover, and her last memory of him was as he had looked leaning over the ship's side. Oddly enough the man next him had been Steenie Lackland. When, at last, the ship moving, she had waved to Sholto, saying "*Au revoir*," she had seen Steenie smile and seen on his lips her own words "*Au revoir*."

This had made her angry, for she thoroughly disliked him, and knew that he wanted to marry her. And intensely as she loathed the man he had a hateful sort of "influence" over her—so she called it to herself, meaning really no more than that, whereas she would wish to be simply oblivious of his existence, she often found herself thinking of him with a sort of repulsion that resembled dread.

In one of his letters, and only one, Sholto alluded to Elsa Nerida. "Thank God," he wrote, "that you gave me your promise not to go near that abominable place. I can see where there was imposture: vulgar imposture. Of course she wore black gloves, and so only her evil face showed in that black room: of course she was an adept at almost miraculously swift movements, and her height is unusual, so she could cause her face to show up in the air, and down near the floor. No doubt there was a blind door in the black wall, with noiseless hinges, and an accomplice within to push it open; she could disappear and reappear almost in an instant. But there was worse than imposture, something foul and evil: something not explicable. There was in that room a Presence worse than hers: a Power greater than mere roguery, but easily linked to every form of untruth."

So far besotted was she that the accusation of trickery angered her, whereas the other insinuation oddly pleased her.

For longer, much longer, than usual Carluccia had not had a letter from him. And she was "on strings": frightened. There had been, everyone said, a new "push" out there. Irresponsible rumour said a disastrous one: and rumour lied, for it had achieved its object, and there was to follow a lull, and officers were being granted leave.

Carluccia now cared only for one thing in life—Sholto. Her love was no longer merely a passion, it was an obsession. Yet it hurried her to disobedience and ruin—of his life and her own.

"I must know," she said to herself. "I *must* know."

And she telegraphed to Elsa Nerida asking for an appointment.

"May we come again?" was her message.

"That will prove her," she told herself, really believing entirely in the woman.

"Yes, come. At five this afternoon. Both of you," was the answer.

The reply did not shake her confidence, because it could not be shaken: it was gone beyond the control of evidence

or reason. But it shook *her*. She went to her appointment trembling.

The blank-faced woman noted that she came alone, and no doubt reported it, but she showed no surprise.

"I knew," said Elsa Nerida when Carluccia was in the black room, "that he would come again."

"He is not here," whispered Carluccia, shivering.

The room was entirely dark. The tripod was unlighted.

"He *is* here," the Sonnambulista insisted, "at your side."

"No," the girl stammered. "He is over there—in France. I came for news. I have not heard of him. I was frightened, and I came for news."

"You said 'we': and you spoke truth. He came with you. He is here. Beside you. His hand will touch yours. . . ."

And a very cold hand, that shook perceptibly, touched Carluccia's. The girl herself was trembling from head to foot.

"Turn to him, if you dare," whispered Elsa Nerida. "If you turn to him he will know that you love him—always."

Carluccia could hardly move: she had heard that Elsa's own voice, usually so impassive, was tense with excitement.

"Ah!" said Elsa, "she dare not."

Then Carluccia turned and other lips met hers, and withdrew instantly. She stretched out her arms but they met nothing.

"I bade him come," whispered the Sonnambulista. "His spirit is of us. Only the temper, a bodily carnal thing, was averse, obstinate. His spirit is free now—and obedient. He came with you. . . ."

For a long time there was no other sound except the awful beating of Carluccia's own heart.

"His spirit?" she stammered at last, a horrible chill creeping all over her.

"Yes. It is free now. It comes to you. Released from the churl-body it is free. . . ."

"He is killed then," thought Carluccia, in a dull amaze of despair.

"Yes," said Elsa Nerida. "Otherwise he would not have come."

III.

Carluccia sat alone in a narrow, but long, plot of garden: tall houses behind her, then the garden, then the road, the embankment, then the river, at high tide.

Steenie Lackland had found her there: how, she did not guess. He had sat beside her and had assured her that she would be his wife.

"It is willed," he had said.

"I loathe you."

"That is nothing. Your fancies are nothing to Fate. It has spoken. One fair man, grey-eyed, hard-mouthed, of masterful temper, was to woo you. But not win you. For him death. Another, of the same description, spared by Fate, shall possess your whole heart. He is near you. . . . Ask Elsa Nerida."

The horror of the threat of Fate overpowered her with loathing. The man saw it, and for the moment chose to leave her. His lips had once touched hers, though she had no suspicion of it. For the moment it sufficed him, and he rose and left her.

For a long time after he had gone she sat there, quite alone, with ineffable sorrow and inexpressible loathing.

With two tags of poetry she ended it.

"'No man can be more wise than Destiny,'" and

"'Man is man and master of his fate.'"

Till it was dark. Then she too arose: went out of the garden: climbed the river wall—and ended it.

At that moment Sholto Maxwell was asking her maid:

"Do you know where she went?"

"I don't know, Sir: but I guess. To Madame Elsa Nerida's."

JOHN AYSCOUGH.

THE SIGN IN THE DESERT

"... Et sicut Moyses exaltavit serpentem in deserto, ita exaltari oportet Filium Hominis..."

I.

Comrade, forbear

To drag me back to torment! Canst not see

How the hot rock here casts on hotter sand

A thin small shadow, like a human hand?

Here, when I felt death nigh, I, aidless, crept!

Here, aidless to the last, ere now had slept—

Why dost thou point where others crowd and stare?

Poor simple souls! Their faith is not for me.

II.

Comrade, mine eyes
Are keen as thine. . . . Thinkst thou I see not plain?
'Tis but our Leader stands there, gaunt and tall,
Lifting a tribal staff in sight of all.
And on it—Ah! My wound afresh doth sting
At the mere semblance of the accursed thing!
'Tis good he spears it there—like sacrifice,
And good to dream I see it writhe—in pain!

III.

. . . . Comrade, be still
A moment, while I watch that barren staff
Stretch forth fair branches, like a verdant tree,
And droop its cool sweet foliage over me!
Wait, while I mark that pendant burden shed
A living radiance from its lifeless head! . . .
'Tis strange! Yet not more strange than this strong thrill
Through mine own flesh. . . . A cup of life I quaff!

IV.

. . . . Comrade, didst see?
I fain would tell thee, ere the dream takes flight,
How, in some wondrous way, the veil was rent! . . .
Why! I could, in this desert, *die*, content,
Because, within it, I have seen—*His Face*. . . .
For thee 'twas but a channel for His grace,
Meaningless, else? . . . Ah, yes! 'Tis clear to me
Thine is the faith that has no need of sight.

V.

Comrade, thine hand!
For now we strike the tents, and must be gone
Out of this haunt of anguish and unrest,
Out of the place where God was manifest.
How, in such guise, I saw the Form of Him
Who dwells, unmoved, between the Cherubim
I know not now. . . . But in His promised land
He may reveal—Haste! Let us journey on!

G. M. HORT.

ANGLICAN PRAYER BOOK REVISION

THESE has been much talk for a long time back about the necessity of revising the Anglican Prayer Book, and as the result a Joint Committee of the two Houses of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury was appointed to look into the subject and report. The Report of this Joint Committee has recently been delivered to the Bishops, and its recommendations have been discussed in the meetings of the Convocation of Canterbury that took place in the first week of last month. On the Tuesday and Wednesday the Bishops considered the suggestion that certain passages should be omitted from the text of the Psalms as it is prescribed for use in the Anglican Prayer Book to be used in the public services, and agreed to a scheme of revision in which that "reform" was included. On the same two days the Lower House considered certain suggested changes in the prayers or other items in the text of the various occasional services. The Convocation was then prorogued by the Archbishop. On the two following days, however, the Lower House resumed its sittings and passed its own resolutions on the question of Psalms revision and other matters.

The movement for revision originated chiefly, we believe, with the High Church party, but, while a few slight changes appear to have been proposed or made in deference to their wishes, the preponderance of the changes made or proposed is, both in weight and in number, on the side of the ultra-Broad Church, or, as we may truly say, the ultra-rationalistic section of the clergy, whose influence is becoming more and more powerful within the Anglican communion. We may best refer to these changes in order, just as they were brought forward, which is just in the order in which occasion for them presents itself in the Prayer Book. We omit, too, the changes proposed in the Communion Service except one of them, the rest not raising any question of importance. This one relates to a proposal to rearrange the text of the central part of the rite in question, so as to bring it back to the order in which it stood in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. The proposal was that what is called the Prayer of Oblation (the prayer beginning *O Lord . . . we Thy humble servants desire Thy fatherly goodness to accept*), which is now separated

from the Prayer of Consecration by the administration of Communion to the celebrant and the people and then by the *Our Father*, shall, with the word "wherefore" prefixed as a connecting link, be brought back to its former place as the continuation of the Prayer of Consecration, so that to that extent the one prayer made out of two thus fused together may retain something of the character of a Canon of the Mass; the Prayer of Humble Access (*We do not presume to come*), the Administration of the sacrament to priest and people, the Prayer of Thanksgiving (*Almighty and everliving God we most heartily thank Thee*), the *Gloria in excelsis* and the Blessing, to follow in this order. This revision of the order of sequence was originally proposed by the Lower House in the Canterbury Convocation of 1914, when it was carried by a majority of 79 against 8, but was afterwards disallowed by the Upper House. The other day it came before the Lower House for reconsideration, and was there somewhat warmly discussed. Eventually it was voted by a majority of 57 against 30, so that it remains for the Bishops to say whether they will now allow it or reaffirm their previous decision.

The proposed changes in the text of the occasional offices were mostly if not entirely in the interest of those clerics who are under the corroding influence of modern rationalistic Biblical criticism. The following passage from the *Church Times* report (July 6th) of the proceedings will exhibit as briefly as possible the nature of the changes demanded by one section, the degree of resistance offered by the other, and the balance of opinion as indicated by the resulting votes:

Lively discussions followed as to the omission from the Baptismal and Marriage Services of the references to Old Testament history. The Dean of Christ Church urged that at the Reformation mystical interpretation ceased to be authoritative. We cannot, with the same conviction as our forefathers, rely on the Old Testament narratives. Dr. Kennett, the Cambridge Professor of Hebrew, warmly supported the omission of the references to Noah and to the passage of the Red Sea, which "we no longer believe to be literal history." Dr. Ayles contested this view, and Chancellor Newbolt challenged the right of Convocation to overrule St. Peter and St. Paul, though that had already been avowedly done as regards the subordination of the sexes (I Cor. xi.). Canon Durst wished to keep the beautiful description of the passage of the Red Sea while eliminating Noah. Our Service spoke of "perishing by water," but a later speaker pointed out that "per aquam" goes with "saved." Canon Barnard had never

heard of these references causing distress to simple minds. Why did not the clergy instruct their people how Christ "*latet in Vetere Testamento et patet in Novo*"? The Archdeacon of Coventry asked why the expression "*Ark of Christ's Church*" should be retained if the story were untrue.

The Dean of Ely held that types are suitable for teaching, but not for devotion. The Archdeacon of Berks asked if the Church of England now abandoned all mystical interpretations, and whether the inspiration of the Holy Ghost was to be ignored. The Archdeacon of Norfolk desired a simpler office; the present one bewildered the poor. The Dean of Canterbury appealed to the ancient Fathers and Catholic consent, as well as to the direct authority of the Apostles.

Dr. Robinson proposed, with the Joint Committee, to substitute the words "*Who in Holy Scripture hast set forth types of the Sacrament of Baptism,*" and the Archdeacon of Winchester seconded this, but it was rejected by 64 to 17. Chancellor Johnson said that the children of Israel were not delivered from the Red Sea, but were baptized unto Moses in it. Archdeacon Ducat replied that the Ark was the main point, not the water. The Archdeacon of Wisbech said that it was educated people, not the poor, who found these types a stumbling-block. The Archdeacon of Dorset thought that controversial references should be excluded from public worship. The Dean of Christ Church, replying, said that there was doubtless some fact underlying the narratives, but no one knew what it was. To say plainly "*didst save Noah,*" etc., was more than we could endorse. We can no longer rely on a great number of arguments from the older Scriptures found in the New Testament. The Fathers themselves came to be dominated by Alexandrine mysticism.

The proposal to omit reference to the types was then carried by 61 to 34—a grave decision.

The above refer to the Baptismal Service, and it is observable that the changes that were not only thus mooted but passed by large majorities, were changes which went the length of discarding some of the most fundamental historical facts that underlie the scheme of the Christian religion as it is presented to us in the New Testament, namely, the descent of all mankind from Adam and Eve, the fact of the fall of Adam which entailed the disaster of original sin on the race, and the destruction by the Flood in penalty for its sins of all the original race save the very few through whom the continuity of the new race with the old was preserved by a special providence of God; finally, the story of the crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites which the express words of the New

Testament have associated with the Sacrament of Baptism as a typical foreshadowing of the latter, together with a formal discarding of the whole scheme of types and anti-types on which St. Paul laid stress as a condition of the right interpretation of the Bible relation of the Old Dispensation to the New.

From the text of the Church Catechism the phrase "children of wrath" disappears, together with the correlative phrase in the Marriage Service which declares that the state of marriage was instituted "in the time of man's innocency," two hits at the doctrine of original sin as no longer tenable in the light of modern knowledge.

The other changes of great significance were made in the Marriage Service apparently with the object of making a concession to the growing disposition to disbelieve in the Old Testament as a trustworthy historical record, even as to the main facts on which its story is based; or of giving effect to the revolt against Bible conceptions of the marriage state which characterizes the present age. Here, again, it is instructive to quote from the *Church Times* report:

The references to Isaac and Rebecca, as well as to Abraham and Sarah, are deleted. But an energetic stand was made for the retention of the reference to Adam and Eve. Canon Drummond spoke of a deliberate attempt, from first to last, to disparage the Old Testament. Archdeacon Ducat said that now the consequence of giving way on an earlier proposal was made clear. Canon Hankey raised a laugh by asking why they should refer to what had turned out an unhappy marriage, and Canon Maclean replied that, happy or unhappy, it was the marriage to which our Lord expressly referred as the home and origin of all union between man and woman, making them one flesh. The Dean of Christ Church, however, contended that the whole conception of marriage had changed since Eden and patriarchal times. He deprecated these "unfortunate references." The Church of England has extraordinarily little hold on the labour world, and working-men are set against the Prayer Book by them. The expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Service was then carried by 44 to 17. The words "didst appoint that out of man (created after thine own image and similitude) woman should take her beginning" are also repugnant to the modern mind, and were changed to "didst after thine own image and similitude create man and woman."

Of other changes we must notice the omission of verses 27 to 34 from the chapter of I Corinthians in the service for

the Burial of the Dead, an omission, the reason for which is perhaps the length of the chapter, and the insertion moved by Dr. Sparrow-Simpson at the close of the same service of the versicle and response *Eternal rest give to him O Lord, and may perpetual light shine upon him*. In regard to this, Dr. Sparrow-Simpson made the very apposite criticism that the "tendency of the service was to divert attention from the departed to the mourners and to teach self-regardingness rather than self-forgetfulness." This brought up Canon Aitken, a well known Low Churchman, who, "while desiring a commendation of the departed to God's keeping pleaded against direct prayer for the dead, which would be a departure from the Reformation Settlement." None the less the motion, on behalf of which the Dean of Wells and the Dean of Lincoln both spoke, was carried by 42 to 4. This was in some sense a victory for the High Churchmen, but the greatness of the majority vote seems to imply that the dislike for the notion of Eternal Punishment had as much to do with it as belief in the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory. Another significant change in the order of the Burial Service was one which prescribes an alternative order for suicides and excommunicated persons, a change which presumably will involve the clergy in great difficulties, in the particular cases where the alternative service might seem to be required by the circumstances.

On the following day (Thursday) in the Lower House a discussion took place which reflected the extent to which Convocation, though it is the highest spiritual authority in the Anglican communion, is prepared to recede from the Church Catholic's traditional doctrine on Holy Scripture. A proposal had been before the Upper House for revising the questions addressed to the candidates in the service for the Ordination of Deacons. The difficulty hinged on one particular question in that service, which the ordaining Bishop puts to the candidates, "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?" The Upper House had revised this question into the form, Do you unfeignedly believe that these Scriptures "convey to us in many parts and in divers manners the revelation of God?" In the Lower House, on behalf of this new point of revision, the Dean of Christ Church said that our wider knowledge of cognate religious beliefs no longer permitted us to believe with the Reformers that Holy Scripture is inspired in every word, but "it did not follow that it was in no sense inspired and peculiar";

whilst the Archdeacon of Gloucester considered this point to be the most important of all they had to deal with, and confessed that "he himself had been almost deterred from ordination by the question to Deacons." The Dean of Canterbury, on the side of Protestant orthodoxy, protested that the new form, that "the Holy Scriptures contain or have preserved some divine truths," might be the case if they were merely secular or pagan documents, and pointed out that "no *authority* was implied in the proposed subscription." As an improvement he suggested that words borrowed from the Act of Toleration of 1689 should be adopted. "Do you acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration?" This, of course, would be to retain the very belief which the rationalistic divines found so objectionable, and was accordingly rejected by "a large majority," as was also Canon Wood's proposal that in place of Dean Wace's "by divine inspiration" should be substituted "by divine authority"; and even Canon Wood's further suggestion that,—in some degree at all events to save the position that in Holy Scripture is contained an authoritative revelation—in place of "the revelation of God" in the new form recommended by the Joint Commission and the House of Bishops, should be substituted "the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ." But this, again, would be retaining the very element of Christian belief which divines like the Dean of Christ Church were seeking to eliminate. One further attempt was made, by Canon Deane, to mitigate the proposed eradication from Holy Scripture of a specifically divine character or influence, namely, by rejecting or amending the ambiguous phrase in the new form "convey to us *in many parts*" which, as Canon Deane justly noted, would be taken "by almost everyone" to mean that "in other parts Holy Scripture did *not* convey God's message." But all was in vain; the proposed formula of the Joint Commission "was carried as it stood by 74 to 4," and the Prolocutor congratulated the House on coming to the end of "a long task," congratulating it, may we not say, in having after all these centuries freed the Anglican Church from that loyalty to belief in the supremacy of the Bible which it used to regard as its chief distinction as contrasted with "the Church of Rome."

But a still more important item in the proposed revision is that which was discussed in the House of Bishops on the Tuesday and Wednesday. On that occasion it fell to the lot

of the Bishop of Ely to introduce a report on the use of the Psalter in the Anglican services. Previously the same subject had been considered by the Convocation of Canterbury, when, however, the two Houses took opposite views. Accordingly, in preparation for the reconsideration of the question in the present meeting, five members of the Northern Convocation had been called in to assist the Committee of the Southern Convocation. It was hoped by this means to harmonize the wishes of the two Houses. The conclusion of the Joint Committee of the Southern Houses, thus strengthened by the infusion of a Northern element, was a report the main feature of which was that it recommended the "omission of passages in the Psalms which do not appear to the Committee to be suitable for recitation in public worship." The omitted passages "are the whole of Psalm 58; Psalms 14, 5-7; 55, 16, 24, 25; 68, 21-23; 69, 23-29; 109, 5-19; 137, 7-9; 139, 19-22; 140, 9, 10; 143, 12, adding the final words 'for I am thy servant' to verse 11." This suggestion of the Committee caused considerable discussion at the recent meeting. But the Upper House was practically unanimous on the point of the omission of the passages, and it even went beyond the Committee which had proposed that the omitted passages should be printed in an appendix to the Psalter. Their Lordships could not agree to printing a selection of imprecatory passages in an appendix. The omissions, they decided, should be indicated in the expurgated psalms by asterisks, and the present numbering of the verses be retained as it is.

One can understand and even sympathize with the motive impelling their Lordships to desire this change, and the Archbishop of Canterbury gave a reason which will appeal to many for regarding the present occasion as specially suitable for introducing a change of this character.

In the course of the discussion the President mentioned incidentally that he had been staggered by the large number of letters he had recently received in consequence of the attitude he had taken up in the matter of reprisals. It was startling and horrible to know the kind of way in which some people regarded this question. "I ventured to say in public that because we saw dead babies in the streets of London we did not want to know of babies killed in a similar way in the streets of German towns. But these people say: 'That is exactly what we do want. We want German streets to run red with blood,' and so on. I am contrasted with Samuel, who hewed Agag in pieces, and I am asked whether I have forgotten 'an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.' That is the kind of thing that has found currency,

not I believe, to any extent, but it would not have been thought or said a little while ago. It seems to be an argument for taking a bold line in what is before us to show that we are not adopting for ourselves phrases which were used in Old Testament times, but not under the dispensation of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." With the slight alterations indicated the Committee's report was adopted.

On the Thursday this same subject was discussed in the Lower House. The resolution which the Upper House had passed on to it was in six sections, all of which save section 3, were agreed to with little debate by the Lower House, but section 3, which contained the Bishops' resolution to omit the maledictory passages, was discussed with intense feeling.

The Dean of Ely observed that the "spirit of the Old Testament" was a protest against unrighteousness and wrong, but was a discordant element in Christian worship. The Dean of Canterbury said that some of the excised passages belonged to the substance and unity of the Psalm—*e.g.*, cxxxvii. 7, 8. With what a new force do such passages as these, "The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance," or "Doubtless there is a God that judgeth the earth," come home to ourselves who see cruel atrocities ruthlessly practised. And compared with the language of the Apocalypse that of the Psalter is mild.

Canon Wood asked what right one province of the Western Church had to overrule and sit in judgment upon the usage of the whole Catholic Church, which had ever recognized the prophetic speaker as our Lord Himself, and the conflict spoken of as the great war between good and evil which must go on until He comes again in triumph. These "imprecations" were but an echo of His "Woes"—was it proposed to omit these from the Table of Lessons? Canon Jones replied that Rome does not read the Psalms in the vulgar tongue, and it was one thing for Christ to denounce, another for us to do so. Yet he considered we were becoming far too squeamish in expressing hatred of the things which Almighty God hates. Canon Aitken held that some of the expressions in the Psalter are an insult to the Divine Majesty. We live under a new Dispensation. The Archdeacon of Sudbury deplored the expunging of these words. The *Gloria* at the end of each Psalm gave it a Christian sense. The Archdeacon of Ely maintained that righteous indignation is an integral element of Christian character. Our people are now deeply stirred, and the Church must not get out of touch with popular feeling. The Archdeacon of Bristol asked who had ever supposed that these denunciations of evil men were meant now for private enemies. The Church united herself thereby with God in His warfare against the might of wrongdoing. Dr.

Kennett, however, held that some of the phrases cannot be spiritualized. A young girl, found in tears, said that if people knew what it was to be orphans they could not use such expressions. Canon Wood pointed out that what the Dean of Ely called a "terrible passage" (lxix. 23ff) was employed in a striking way by St. Paul and cix. 5ff by St. Peter. Surely God the Holy Ghost knew that the Psalter would not be used only in the Synagogue. Canon Lake and Canon Bernard pleaded for the retention of the words, "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee?" Canon Wood said that such words are applicable to spiritual powers of evil. Are we not to express our loathing of Satan and his angels?

The result was that the retention of these maledictory passages was negatived by a small majority, 26 against 23. Thus the two Houses were in agreement on the main point, and in the Lower House was suggested a neat escape from the alternatives of enclosing the omitted passages in square brackets which Dr. Ayles deemed to be an undesirable way of calling attention to them, and merely omitting them without calling attention to their omission, which the Dean of Ely thought would not be straightforward. For an Archdeacon's suggestion was that after the heading "Psalms of David" should be added the words, "as appointed to be read." But even this suggestion was rejected, and so another matter—so far, that is, as is permitted by Parliament, whose sanction is ultimately necessary for any alterations in the service books—of the gravest moment has been decided for the Anglicans on the lines of the disintegrating theology of German Liberalism. For our part we see nothing in this to triumph over but rather much to lament.

It is for the Anglicans to settle their own problems as to the propriety of this or that feature in their public services, and we can enter into the feelings expressed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the passage we have quoted from his speech in Convocation. It is intelligible that educated Anglicans—and, as one or two of the speakers in Convocation remarked, it is these, not the poor or the average Anglican worshippers, who take the offence—should find it hard to be required to identify themselves with some of the maledictory language of the Psalms. But, if it is not too late, and is not deemed unwarrantably intrusive, we would suggest to those concerned, that it is not essential to participation in services, parts of which are taken from Scripture or other historical sources, that the worshipper should make his own, by assenting to it on his own behalf, *all* that these parts affirm. Our priests, who are bound to say the Divine Office in the Breviary—an

Office containing all the Psalms without omissions, together with many historical Lections referring to lives of the Saints, or the origin of devotions—understand well that their obligation is to *recite* all which is in their text, but not necessarily to *affirm* for themselves all that is affirmed therein; they have only to read or recite what has been affirmed by others, a very different thing from affirming for ourselves. Many of the historical Lections set down passages of history, as it was understood at the time of their composition, which nevertheless it is now recognized may be no longer tenable, or only doubtfully tenable. It is not quite the same with passages from the Psalms, which are covered by inspiration, yet prayers which as coming from the lips of the Psalmists may be justifiable under the circumstances in which they wrote, are not necessarily deemed, even by those who take the most rigid view of inspiration, to be suitable prayers for a Christian reciter of the Office.

This is a very practical point, for it removes all difficulty from the path of those who have to recite the Psalms in public or private worship, and allows the speculative solution of the problems, moral and otherwise, the Psalms present to stand over for leisurely study or authoritative exposition. It is also a principle by accepting which we place ourselves in the same standpoint with the early Fathers of the Church, many of whom were as keenly alive to the difficulty raised by the language of some of the maledictory Psalms as any of the moderns who are now rebelling against the custom which obliges them to join in their recitation in church. Take, for instance, St. John Chrysostom, an interpreter who quite understood and felt this difficulty, as may be seen from his Homily on Psalm cviii. (109) where, after massing together the maledictions which the Psalmist utters against the unjust man, he asks: "Does not what is thus said appal the hearers? Especially when we hear the prophet pronouncing these curses it behoves us to seek to learn, in the spirit of fear and humility, who he is that has incurred such severe wrath, who has so grieved the Holy Spirit as to be threatened with such divers kinds of evils. . . . How too it is that the Prince of the Apostles can point to this Psalm as said of Judas, for he says [in his address to the disciples during their days of retirement whilst awaiting the descent of the Holy Ghost] it is written in the Book of Psalms 'Let his dwelling place be desert and let there be no one to dwell in his house'." St. John Chrysostom's interpretation is that we have in this Psalm "a prophecy

under the form of an imprecation," and he points for similar examples in the sacred books to the prophecies of Jacob in Genesis xxix. But what we wish to note in the first place as bearing out what we have said of the attitude adopted by the Saint in regard to passages like these, is that he does not find in the difficulty of the language a reason for discontinuing reverence or recite Psalms of this sort, and in this is like the Fathers generally and the other writers of the Church, indeed of the Church itself during all these centuries, not to speak of the Apostles, who, in various passages of the New Testament, have drawn citations and recognized predictions in these very maledictory passages. Compare, for instance, John xv. 25, which refers back to Psalm lxviii. (109), 5; John ii. 17, which refers back to lxix. 19; Romans xv. 3, which refers back to that same verse; Acts i. 20, which refers back to its verse, 26; and Rom. xi. 9, which refers back to its verse, 23. Moreover, though there is there no explicit citation of this Psalm, one cannot read its verses 13 and 22 without feeling that St. John, in the wording of his narrative, had it well before his mind. It may be said that at all events these references to Psalm lxviii. in the New Testament do not cite from it the parts that are maledictory. True, and we can understand why these were unsuitable in the mouth of our Lord, but to cite at all from the Psalm is to imply that it was a prophetic document requiring to be received with all reverence, whereas if it were deserving of the rejection with which the Anglican Houses of Convocation have visited it, it is an utterly immoral document from which Christian writers like those of the New Testament ought to have revolted altogether instead of resorting to it for becoming citations.

For the reasons given it is inexplicable that the Anglican Bishops and Proctors in Convocation should have set these Psalms aside as they have done, and not rather, even if they wished to omit certain passages from them on the ground that their modern ill-instructed congregations were sure to understand them amiss, should at least have taken the opportunity to suggest a suitable explanation of their incorporation in books which even they regard as sacred, and some of them regard as inspired.

It would be impossible at the end of an article to discuss adequately, or even sufficiently for practical purposes, the interpretation which these maledictory Psalms require to bring out their consistency with the true sentiments which men should have towards their persecutors. But a passage from

a writer on the nature of inspiration may profitably end this article, by indicating the principles on which such an interpretation should rest.

"Set up against him a sinner and let the accuser stand at his right hand. When he is judged let him go forth condemned and let his prayer be turned into sin." These and what follow in Psalm cviii. appear to be sentiments of unjust hatred. But the conditions of lyrical poetry must be borne in mind. The poet is not thinking of any private enemy, but of those who are in contempt of the divine law rebelling against the dominion of God Himself and are hardened in their iniquity. God had promised many good things to the faithful observers of His law, but had prescribed the gravest punishments for those who obstinately transgressed it (Levit. xxvi.). The Psalmist asks therefore God to arm against the sinners and stand by His promises [for the delivery and protection of His persecuted servants]. "And do Thou O Lord deal with me according to Thy name . . . and let them know that Thy hand hath done this and that Thou hast done it" (Psalm cviii. 21, 27). Moreover this Psalm is also prophetic, showing what God is about to do. Thus the sentiment of the Psalmist is that of petition and of prediction of the future humiliation of the enemies of God. Compare Psalm lxxii., where the same subject is declared not by way of petition but by way of a consideration." Lo! the sinners and those who abound in this world have obtained wealth. . . . But Thou hast set them in slippery places, Thou hast cast them down and destroyed them (lxxii. 12, 18). To desire and predict the humiliation of the enemies of God is not immoral. The phrases then of Psalm cviii., though in themselves harsh, are not different from those which God Himself in sanctioning the Law has often used. At the same time it must be remembered that not all things which are moral are equally perfect, and whilst, during the Old Testament times, religious and moral knowledge grew to the standard of the New Testament, there can be, and in fact are, things which do not become the more excellent religious and moral state introduced by Christ. Thus, then, God could without doubt inspire sentiments which were imperfect, but it must be flatly denied that anything which He inspired can be immoral in the sense of the sacred author. (Ch. Pesch *De Inspir.* S.S. p. 454).

And this is what in substance St. John Chrysostom has said in his Homily on Psalm cxxxvi. (137) when commenting on the harsh phrase "Blessed shall he be who will dash thy little ones against a rock" which he understands as attributed poetically to the captives at Babylon, he concludes with the words: "Not such is the language of the New Testament where we are commanded to feed our enemies and nourish them, and to pray for them who spitefully use us."

S. F. S.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

IRISH FREEMASONRY IN 1800.

WE greatly regret that in an article on Freemasonry in our June number we were led to make a statement which may have given scandal and caused distress to some of our brethren in the Sister Isle. In referring incidentally to the proceedings of the Ennis Lodge in the year 1800, we described a certain Catholic ecclesiastic, who preached a sermon there in favour of Freemasonry, as the Rev. Dr. McDonogh, Coadjutor Bishop of Killaloe.¹ This, as his Lordship, the present Bishop of the Diocese, has pointed out to us, is altogether without foundation, and we are glad to take this opportunity of withdrawing unreservedly any imputation which may seem to have been involved in the allegation made. The mistake, as will readily be believed, did not originate with THE MONTH, and we feel we owe it to our readers to explain how we were betrayed into this quite incorrect description. Our authority for the account given, as we indicated in a footnote, was an article in the *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, a carefully edited periodical, which the *Catholic Encyclopædia* (IX. 771), for instance, describes as "the best scientific Masonic magazine." Moreover, in this particular case the fact that the Masonic Lodge of Ennis met on the feast of St. John Baptist and then marched to "prayers" (*i.e.* to Mass) at the Catholic chapel where "an excellent sermon upon Masonry" was preached by a certain "Rev. Dr. McDonough," who dined with the members afterwards, is beyond dispute. The extract from the Register was reproduced in facsimile and the very terms of the entry would alone have been sufficient to authenticate it. As is well known to those who have made a study of 18th century Catholicism, our forefathers in those days were at pains to avoid the term "Mass." Dr. E. Burton in his *Life of Bishop Challoner*

¹ There was a Coadjutor Bishop of Killaloe at the time, Dr. O. Shaughnessy. (See Maziere Brady, *Episcopal Succession*, II. 122—123). On the death of the then Bishop, Dr. McMahon, in 1802, he succeeded to the See.

(I. 139), quotes a witness who describes how she first assisted at a Catholic Religious service, "or at 'Prayers' as it was generally called, for the word 'Mass' was scarcely ever used in conversation." Further, as we also pointed out, the fact is not denied that the great patriot, Daniel O'Connell, had been a Freemason in early life. He had indeed been Worshipful Master, and even after the year 1810 had taken a prominent part in founding other Lodges. Nevertheless when challenged on the point in 1837 he had been able to declare in a letter to the public press that he had not known at the time that Freemasonry was under the ban of the Church. The mistake, therefore, made in our June article was not that of giving currency to a fictitious tale, but of accepting an incorrect description of the ecclesiastic principally concerned in it.

As to this last matter, the statement in the *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum* was most explicit, and the appeal made to the Catholic Qualification Rolls of Ennis, 1793, apparently removed all ground for suspicion. Not only did the writer, the late Dr. Crawley, declare that "there can be no doubt that Dr. McDonogh was the Most Reverend the Coadjutor Bishop of Killaloe," but in a footnote he stated that the entry in the Rolls had been verified by a brother Mason whose name is given and who was then an official of high standing in the Public Record Office, Ireland. We have taken some pains to investigate the matter, and by the kindness of Mr. McEnery, the present Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, Ireland, we have been favoured with a copy of the precise terms of the entry in the Catholic Qualification Rolls referred to. Here is the relevant portion of the document.

Catholic Qualification Roll, Co. Clare, 1793.

(Declaration and Oath.)

Sworn in open Court the 29th July, 1793 . . .

Michael Peter McMahon, T.¹ Bishop of Killaloe. Jas. Barrett, T.¹ Dean of Killaloe, Pastor of Ennis. Patrick McDonogh, Coadjutor of Ennis . . .

30th day of July, 1793.

Dennis Cahill, Assistant Clergyman of Ennis, &c.

From this it plainly appears that in 1793 there was a priest living at Ennis named Patrick McDonogh who describes himself in the Roll as "Coadjutor of Ennis." It is in this

¹ As the Record Office officials point out, the T. undoubtedly stands for "Titular."

designation that we have the source of the mistake, for mistake it undoubtedly is. The word "Coadjutor" was not at that date distinctive of the episcopal order, but it seems, as we find upon further investigation, to have been used in Ireland, and possibly elsewhere, as practically the equivalent of curate. The Reports which were sent in to Lord Castlereagh by the Irish Catholic Bishops in 1800 and which are printed in the fourth volume of the Castlereagh *Memoirs*, supply numerous examples. For instance, the same Dr. M. P. McMahon, Bishop of Killaloe, who signed the Roll in 1793, states in his Report, dated 10 Nov. 1800 :

The number of Coadjutors is variable and it depends upon the infirmity or old age of the Pastors . . . the Curate or Coadjutor is supported by the Parish Priest.¹

From this, of course, it follows that at the time when Dr. P. McDonogh, Coadjutor of Ennis, publicly preached his "excellent sermon upon Masonry" he was deriving his support from the Parish Priest of Ennis, who was apparently the Dean of the diocese. So in another Report we learn that "there are nearly 800 Curates or Coadjutors, making with the Parish Priests upwards of 1800 Roman Catholic clergymen in this Kingdom," or again that "the Prebendaries, Rectors, Vicars and Curates or Coadjutors are all appointed by the respective Bishop," and again, "The reason existing for a Coadjutor or second assisting Priest in Edenderry is that the Parish Priest is very old and quite blind."²

The origin of the mistake is thus obvious enough, but while we may acquit Dr. Crawley of any deliberate falsification, we cannot justify his reticence as to the real terms of the entry in the Qualification Roll. No reader who examines the text and footnote of the article could fail to draw the inference that the document contained *en toutes lettres* the name of "Dr. Patrick McDonogh, Coadjutor Bishop of Killaloe," and this it certainly does not do, but simply "Coadjutor of Ennis," which is quite a different thing. Further, we cannot help deploring the fact that the responsible officials of such an institution as the Public Record Office, Ireland, should, owing to the circumstance of their being aliens to the faith of the vast majority of the people, be unable to interpret the meaning

¹ Castlereagh, *Memoirs*, IV. 127.

² *Ibid.* pp. 99, 98, 130.

of designations which must be liable to occur at every turn in the documents of quite recent date committed to their care.

As regards the prohibition of Masonry in 1800, the obviously tolerant view of the Catholic population of Ennis seems to have extended to other things besides secret societies. Mr. H. Dalton, a rather Puritanical but seemingly honest Protestant, who wrote a *Statistical Survey of Clare*, which was published in 1808, gives some curious information regarding the condition of the country.

For a sample [he says] of the conduct of those in the middling and lower ranks I must send my readers to Ennis on a Sunday morning; there they will see shops open, goods hanging at the doors for sale, standings in the streets, timber for sale leaning against the sessions-house, in short every appearance of business as there was on the previous market-day; and many neighbouring ladies defer their shopping until that day, after paying their devotions to heaven, totally regardless of the fourth commandment. Had I not frequently seen magistrates sharing in this monstrous abuse of the sabbath, I could not have thought there was one in the town; it surely would be a meritorious act of the Lord Chancellor to supersede the abettors of such gross impiety.¹

The writer is equally emphatic in his comments upon the disgracefully dilapidated condition of the Protestant churches.

The churches in general seem greatly neglected; the seats are scarcely ever dusted, except by the coats of the congregation; the windows are seldom opened to admit fresh air; indeed this is the less necessary as there is generally plenty of broken panes, broken doors and broken roofs. If a church has been whitewashed once in five or six years, the spattering remains on the windows until the rain washes it off.²

Perhaps some light is thrown upon the whole situation by the final remarks which follow:

It is with great pleasure I am now to close these observations with a remark as to the cordiality that subsists in this county between the Protestants and the Catholics. They intermarry according to their inclination and circumstances, without any impediment from a difference of persuasion, and live in habits of sincere friendship and good will, free from that bigotry and rancour, that tend to the ruin and disgrace of other parts of Ireland, and which under the pretence of religion violate its pure and benevolent principles.³

¹ *Survey of Clare*, p. 358.

² *Ibid.* p. 35.

³ *Ibid.* p. 369.

As to the accuracy of these statements we can offer no opinion, but if true they go some way to explain that tolerance of Freemasonry of which the Ennis incident affords so striking an example.

H. T.

UNITY IN TRUTH.

IN our last issue we called attention to the earnest desire for unity which manifested itself last June in the meetings of the General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland, and found a valuable expression in the final Address of its Moderator for this year, Dr. James Cooper, of Glasgow. And, in protest against the precipitancy of those Catholics who are apt to repel all such desires and projects for reunion on the ground that they fall short of the standard which could alone make them practical, we gathered up five important points of reaction against the divisive ideals of past sectarian history, which should move us to recognize in the growth of this new spirit a solid advance in the direction of Catholic ideals. Something of the same spirit has been noticeable in the meetings of the Wesleyans here in England during the month of July. We are not proposing to refer to these manifestations in detail, but does not the persistency and spread of this spirit suggest to us Catholics that we should offer to those whom it is so powerfully moving the fruits of our own experience and reflection as to what is necessary if a movement of this kind is to succeed?

One of the five points which Dr. Cooper emphasized in that final address was, as we took note last month, that no solid basis for the restoration of unity can be found in ambiguous formulas which different sections among the reunited members understand differently. The recognition of this, so far as it is deepening among our separated brethren, we take to be an immense gain to the cause of reunion. We say, so far as it is deepening among them; for the theory of Concords which was initiated among the Protestant bodies by the Concord of Wittenberg, and was followed by others of the same kind elsewhere, as in this country by the imposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, sounded promising enough at first. It rendered possible for the time being unity of government and community of access to sacramental rites within

the limits of the concurring bodies. But long experience has shown them how unsatisfactory a process it is, how unable it is to resist the dissolvent action of private judgment which, except where mental somnolence prevails, has proved to be, as the proverb says, as multiiform as the heads of those who exercise it, and how in consequence, as time runs on and phases of thought and speculation succeed one another, the tendency strengthens to chafe under the limitations of these written Concords, and to question the right of their governing authorities to impose such limitations on the private judgment of the members without being able to offer them any guarantees of a discernment superior to their own. It is from this source that have come the endless separations and subdivisions of Protestant sects: or else the not less disastrous alternative of schools of thought tolerated within the ranks of religious communions though diametrically opposed to the terms of their written Concords. This, we say, is the fatal outcome of systems of religious union based on ambiguous formulas, or even on formulas in themselves fairly definite but rendered ambiguous by the habit of tolerating contradictory beliefs among those who resort to the same symbolic rites. And it is this deep-rooted experience which has convinced many like Dr. Cooper, and led them to feel that the way to the reunion they all desire is not to be found by this path.

What then follows? If our Lord exhorted His faithful followers to unity both of belief and communion and prayed that it might become their distinguishing mark, surely He must have made provision for its maintenance among them, and so planned it that it may be maintained without requiring them to be disloyal to the rational instinct that is in their nature to cling to the truth and that alone. There must be such a method of reunion open for us all to adopt, and the thing for all who would find it is to seek it diligently and without prejudice. And the service we conceive ourselves enabled to suggest to these seekers who command all our sympathy, is that of calling their attention to a few points which underlie and motive our own attachment to the great Church which has kept unity, both of belief and practice, among far the largest mass of the population who profess the Christian name. We would invite them to reflect in the first place that the unity of any society, be it that of a kingdom, of an

army, of a trades' union, or whatever else, is obtainable only so far as the members are ready to accept from its governing body the direction of its action and, in some sort at least, even of its opinions and principles. Let this readiness be fixed and durable and the requisite unity will be maintained, apart of course from outlying causes of dissolution, as of conquest or financial insufficiency. It must be the same with a religious society, or Church as we are wont to call it; and we have seen how to this extent all Churches have been constituted on that principle. No doubt with a Church there is a further element of difficulty, and we have already referred to it. How can we trust the decisions or doctrines of a Church the governing body of which cannot give us a guarantee that its qualifications for discerning the truth of the Christian revelation are superior to our own personal capacities? True, how can we? *Proximus est quisque sibi*. If we cannot so far trust the authority of the Church we are considering, as to be convinced that, if there is conflict between its decisions and our own, it is the latter that must be in error, how can we remain loyal members of that Church? Yet what else does this come to save the certainty that, unless there exists a Church endowed by its Divine Founder with infallibility, it cannot have indefectibility, and we are forced to the ultimate conclusion that religious divisions are not to be attributed to men's sins, but to the simple fact that our Lord has not provided us with a means of living in unity that is adapted to our rational natures. And when any class of men have been brought to this inevitable conviction, does not the fact that one Church and one only on earth has persistently claimed the gift of infallibility through the abiding presence in its midst of the Holy Spirit of God guiding it into all truth, and this Church has preserved unity among its members on a vast and enduring scale—does not this great broad fact become at once intensely impressive for them? It is this at all events that has led so many into the Catholic Church, men and women who have started from religious positions far removed from this, and were held back by feelings of antipathy to many Catholic doctrines, which appeared to them then well-grounded. Impelled by the conviction that unity must be the mark of God's Church, they have examined earnestly and prayerfully Catholic principles of authority and Catholic dogmatic beliefs, and the further they have pro-

ceeded in their research the more they have discovered to how large an extent what held them back was misconception, and what Catholicism required them to believe, so far from being flagrantly opposed to rational principles or authenticated historical facts, was in the firmest accord with both.

S. F. S.

WHY ROMAN CATHOLIC?

AMONG the many inconsistencies of the average Anglican, none is more noteworthy than the difference between his conciliatory treatment of the Eastern Communion and his ill-concealed dislike of papal Rome. For the Russo-Greek Church he has every consideration. Though he claims that his own creed is perfectly orthodox he makes no difficulty in conceding to the Christians of holy Russia the style of the Orthodox Church *par excellence*. In regard to Rome, however, his attitude is much less complaisant. All his fellow-subjects who recognize the supremacy of the Holy See must be called not Catholics but Roman Catholics. Indeed if the prelates and laity of that communion wish to present a complimentary address to Royalty, such an address can only be received on condition that the signatories lay aside the name used by their religious brethren from China to Peru and adopt the designation recognized by the English Acts of Parliament.

Under these circumstances the Westminster Catholic Federation have done an excellent work in publishing in combination with the Catholic Truth Society the very able pamphlet which appears under the heading we have borrowed for this note. Father Messenger has put the case clearly and effectively. Though the point involved might seem to be merely a question of a name, there is a matter of principle lying behind it. As the writer well says, "like *homoousion* and *homoiousion*, 'Catholic' or 'Roman Catholic' in its sectional sense stands historically for fundamentally different conceptions of a Christian dogma." Father Messenger has brought together several new and useful illustrations culled from such writers as Lingard and W. G. Ward, and he has fully exposed a characteristically inaccurate statement in Dr. Littledale's *Plain Reasons* that the Church's "official title,

as fixed by herself at Trent and retained, in spite of a protest, by the Vatican Council, is *Roman Catholic*."

If, however, we have touched upon the subject in this place, our main object is to add a supplementary note to the article which appeared in these columns some few years ago.¹ We then noticed—and Father Messenger has reproduced the quotation in the pamphlet before us—that Bishop Andrewes, replying to Cardinal Bellarmine in 1609, ridiculed the name *Roman Catholic* as a contradiction in terms. We have since then stumbled upon two passages in Dr. S. R. Gardiner's *Camden Society* volume on the Court of High Commission, which show that Andrewes' contemporary, George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, was in the habit of making blustering speeches to the same effect when acting as President of the Court. For example, when a reputed priest was being tried before the High Commission on 27th Oct. 1631, the Bishop of Lichfield having declared that the man under examination had confessed himself "a Romish Catholick," the Archbishop, we are told,

took exception at the words *Romish Catholick*, which implied a meere contradiction. "For," said the Archbishop, "*Romish* implyeth a particular Church, and *Catholick* an universall."

Still more emphatically on another occasion (7th June, 1632), when a woman was being examined whose husband was stated to be "the Queene's servant and a stiffe *Romane Catholique*," the Archbishop of Canterbury broke out :

Your husband, they say, is a *Romane Catholique*; this is a most absurd thing to profess to be—a *Romane Catholique*. The words imply a contradiction. Rome is a particular Church, *Catholicke* is universall. Then this is as much as to say of a particular universall Church. Nonsense!²

No satisfactory evidence has yet been produced that the followers of the old religion ever called themselves *Roman Catholics* from choice. If they ever consented to employ the name it was because the alternative was to be styled *Papists* or something equally offensive. Sometimes the term "*Catholic Roman Church*" was employed by them, but this, as Father Messenger shows, carried a different implication. Some excellent illustrations, let us note, may be found in a volume,

¹ See *THE MONTH*, Sept. 1911.

² S. R. Gardiner, *Star Chamber and High Commission Papers*, pp. 196 and 300.

printed in 1598, but written some ten years earlier, and entitled *A Courteous Conference with the English Catholickes Romane* by "John Bishop, a recusant papist." For sum total there remains the fact that we Catholics are practically constrained by legal enactment to submit to an official designation which the highest dignitaries of the Anglican Church have pronounced to be self-contradictory.

H. T.

THE ENGLISH SCHISM.

THE sin of Schism is not an easy matter to define, or to describe precisely; and, by consequence, the history of a schism is more difficult to relate without exaggeration than that of a heresy. The English Schism forms no exception to the rule: on the contrary the many interests involved in its continuance to-day, make it most difficult for many otherwise fair and judicial minds to think and write about it quite dispassionately.

In a late issue of *The Church Times* (6 July) "Cismarine" writes upon the subject from an Anglican point of view cleverly and vigorously, yet not without some subtle special pleading. The present writer, though not unappreciative of some bantering praise, is not without a feeling that his own words have been there quoted in a way which, by association at least, may be misleading. They may there seem to excuse that very English Schism which they were intended to condemn.

We both agree that the English clergy of 1559 were very yielding and subservient. That was the fault of the age, and it was carried to far greater lengths by the Parliament, by the nobles, and by the juries than by the clergy. It was most distressing and most fruitful of evil consequences. But "Cismarine's" next assumption is quite inconsequent. "Why," he queries, "were the English clergy, who had been eager for reconciliation in 1553, *as eager to break with Rome* six years later?" The words italicized are utterly unhistorical. While the clergy were at liberty they were outspokenly for the old religion. The voice of Convocation (maugre the crown) was uncompromising. The Universities also declared for the ancient Church. Innumerable details might be cited on this point (see especially the Spanish and the Venetian *Calendars*

of *State Papers*, Sander's Letter to Cardinal Moroni in *Catholic Record Society*, i. &c.).

Indeed "Cismarine" most emphatically says that the defect of the clergy was not over-activity, but servility. "Pliable as osiers," is his extremely vivid phrase. This is clearly incompatible with describing them, as he afterwards does, as so "eager to break with Rome," that the change could be effected in a few weeks.

The prime defect of "Cismarine's" history is that he leaves out Cecil and his political colleagues. Does he not know that Elizabeth's Reformation was really due to that statesman who was called ironically, but with much truth, the King of England? "Cismarine" says truly enough that Elizabeth "cared little enough about these things." In her heart she probably preferred the old order: but with Cecil as her mouthpiece, she betrayed no such preference. He had persuaded her that she was not safe except in the Protestant camp and under his guidance: and his persuasions prevailed again and again. Elizabeth might dally with Catholic matches, or with Protestant marriages that would indirectly bring power to the Catholic party. She several times carried her flirtations to the greatest lengths; and made Cecil feel deeply her acrimony and resentment: but she never broke with him, and always eventually gave way to his insistence.

Cecil's was the brain that planned Elizabeth's Reformation, the hand that guided her Church policy. No doubt he would have gone further, if the field had been quite open. But the compromises arrived at were in terms of his dictation. He was the true nursing father of the Church of England as it actually exists. Neither does this prevent our giving Queen Elizabeth the honour or dishonour of being its foundress. It was her function as a constitutional Queen to act through her Ministers. She did so, and for better or for worse her name is rightly put first both in popular and in scientific histories.

The unfortunate clergy, who yielded to Tudor violence, were the very reverse of eager for change. We must lament their numbers, which even when most soberly estimated, were large. Those who stood firm, though too few to eliminate all shame for the compliance of the majority, are at all events most amply sufficient as witnesses to attest what the faith of the ancient Church really was.

J. H. P.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

**A Renewal of
our Ideals.**

The dawn of the fourth year of this world-war cannot but provoke the most serious reflections amongst all the belligerents. Victory will prove in the material order only less costly than defeat: in the moral order, justice will, we trust, be vindicated, reparation made to the wronged, and the guilty punished more or less severely according as they deny or own their guilt. The aim of the Allies will be unfulfilled if the peace of the world remains still at the mercy of militarism. It is the right of the conqueror, in default of adequate guarantees, to deprive the unjust aggressor of the means of repeating his offence. But, even for the restoration of the moral order, we and many generations of our descendants will have had to pay very heavily. All the more, then, should we insist on the goods being delivered. The radical change in the government of Russia and the entrance of America into the war on her own account clearly necessitate a re-statement of our war-aims, of the ideals for which we are fighting, and the achievements in the field which will make those ideals actual. It would be of immense advantage to the Allied cause if, at this crisis in the conflict, a brief, clear and unrhetoical declaration of the reasons which compel us to go on with it were issued by competent authority. We have to convince many of our own people that our ideals are not lowered or altered, we have to show America and Russia that we are free from lust of territory and commercial greed, we have to persuade neutrals that, here at least and now, justice is our aim and inspiration, and finally we have to let the German people know that we are not bent on their annihilation, their financial ruin, their political enslavement. This cannot be done, it is true, by words alone, least of all by words which are contradicted by other words. It is for the Government to declare our aims: if the Press or any section of it issues a different declaration, the Government must formally repudiate it.

**The "Saturday
Review" and
Democracy.**

The *Saturday Review*, which has changed its editor but not mended its manners, has lately been sneering at President Wilson's ideal of a League of Democratic Nations, which after the war shall mobilize the good-will and common-sense of humanity to prevent the repetition of such an atrocity. With incredible blindness it derides the momentous effect which the President's bold declaration of the rights of nations to self-government and Russia's dramatic assertion of those rights are having and will continue to have amongst all civilized peoples.

With equal want of tact and taste it scoffs at the President's "Holy Alliance," and Mr. Balfour's posing in the States as a democrat. It further professes unconcern as to the effect of the war on Germany's internal political organization, as if the future peace of the world did not depend on the overthrow of autocracy there. This is the sort of guidance which a certain section of the public is getting from its press, and it emphasizes the need of a well-defined lead from the Government. As for the "democratization of Germany," it may be urged that according to the democratic ideal every people should be free to choose its own form of government. If, then, Germany prefers to be ruled by a military autocracy, why should the rest of the world complain? The rest of the world complains because a military autocracy is incompatible with the peace of the world, which is an international concern. It is certain that such a Government has no real interest in peace. It was militarist Germany that opposed consistently and persistently every project that promised to make the Hague Conventions effective. So, in order that Germany may be fitted to consort with the free nations of the world, she must to some extent embrace their ideals and the political form of their embodiment. She must do so without external restraint. There will, indeed, be no need to employ force in the matter, other than the force of circumstances. The German people has hitherto tolerated Hohenzollernism because that system has brought them unity, prosperity and peace, at the price, it is true, of more precious things. If they find that a continuance of the system involves their remaining outside the comity of nations, with all the drawbacks that that ostracism implies, they will certainly recover their lost ideals of personal freedom. The State will again be recognized as an organization created for the citizen, not the citizen for the State.

**The Evils of
Nationalism.**

A very salutary reminder of the necessity of this subordination of means to end, of the State to the individual's higher welfare, was recently given by a politician whose ancestors would be shocked to find him in that particular galley, Lord Hugh Cecil. Speaking on "Christianity and Nationalism," on May 14th, he said: "The real source of the war is the proposition that we owe a boundless devotion to our own country, and nothing whatever to any country but our own," and then he went on to denounce this exaggerated Nationalism as obscuring the higher loyalty to humanity which is taught by the Christian religion. He pointed out that all Christians were agreed on this: that all mankind forms one family which should be united by Christian love. This was an idea fully accepted in pre-Reformation times before the break-up of the Holy Roman Empire. The

speaker did not say how much the revolt from the Catholic Church had done to accentuate national differences and obscure the idea of human brotherhood. The Nationalism which he deplored, and which he declared incompatible with Christianity, is precisely that unhealthy development of the sentiment, which found and finds expression in "national" churches, and which made and makes religion a source of hostility instead of a bond of union. Elizabeth's minister Cecil, who persuaded that monarch to set up again a National Church in this land, is largely responsible for the development here of that Nationalism which certainly proved incompatible with Catholicism, and which now his descendant asserts is incompatible with Christianity itself.

**A League
of Nations
Conference.**

On July 17th the League of Nations Conference Committee convened an inter-denominational meeting of clergymen at Westminster to discuss the formation of a union of States

pledged to give substance and reality to international law by forcibly preventing or punishing its violation in certain definite cases. It is proposed to call other conferences for the benefit of other professional classes, the object of the Committee being to habituate the community to organize for peace with as much care and energy as they have hitherto organized for war. Nothing provides a better test for the reality of a person's moral principle than this question of war and peace. People are exceedingly keen about their country's rights, ready to face sacrifices and even to die for them, but if their zeal is really zeal for justice and not mere self-seeking they should also be ready to recognize and support other people's rights. Much of what we call patriotism is but sublimated selfishness, the desire to possess for ourselves to the exclusion of others what they have as much right to as we. It must be remembered that real rights on the same level can never clash, for the very definition of a right is a moral claim which others are bound in justice to respect. But so-called rights are often ill-founded and ill-defined: hence the constant need of adjustment and compromise. The League of Nations Society has a stupendous task before it in teaching true patriotism to a people largely debauched by the jingo spirit, and making public opinion more keen for justice than for self-interest. This is the very function of Christianity, and hence it deserves the support of all Catholics.

**The Holy See
as a
Moral Force.**

Mgr. H. J. Grosch, speaking as a representative Catholic at the meeting, presented a well-reasoned case for the inclusion of the Holy See in any organized effort for the promotion of permanent peace. His remarks naturally enough were not received with any sign of enthusiasm by his audience, the bulk

of whom represented Churches dissenting from "Rome" and by tradition and training opposed to any exaltation of its horn. But the speaker in his plea set aside the religious question as irrelevant, and merely asked his hearers to recognize an already existing fact, viz., that the Catholic Church is world-wide, and looks upon the Pope as the God-appointed guardian of faith and morals, and that therefore the Roman Pontiff is incomparably the greatest moral force in the world. The Governments which established the Hague Conferences, yielding to anti-clerical influences, foolishly excluded the Holy See from their deliberations, so that there was no authoritative statement heard there of international morality. The same influences will be, and actually are, at work to prevent the Pope from being represented at the future Peace Conference. The little British Rationalist clique has been memorializing other little Continental cliques of the same kidney against the suggestion, and soliciting the aid of atheist Freemason bodies abroad. But the world after three years' war is wiser than it was, for it knows now what happens when morality is internationally disregarded. It knows too how little Rationalism can do to staunch the wounds or tame the passions of humanity. So there is every hope that reason, or rather mere common sense, may triumph over prejudice and malice. Meanwhile, those devout Anglicans and others, who take pleasure in belittling the Holy Father, will be wise to consider the company in which they find themselves.

**Prussianism
at
Home.**

International Justice is a crying need; but Justice like Charity should begin at home. If a man has little concern for the rights of his neighbour, denies him just service or fair wage, owns no common bond but the sordid "cash nexus" so loathed by Carlyle, he will not be inclined to trouble about the rights of the foreigner. The absence of conscience in the mutual relations of States is but a reflection of this banishment of morals from industry. The lust for unmerited or unlawful gain that vitiates our commerce shows itself too in that prolific source of international disputes, the exclusion of rivals from the markets of the world. Selfish individualism is a moral disease which infects the State as well as the citizen. We maintain against the Communist that a measure of competition is helpful to trade, stimulates production, and keeps down prices. But it must be competition within the limits of the moral law, and consistent with justice to the competitor. In like manner, against the cosmopolitan, we contend that the world's progress is secured by the competition of States, provided it is under the same control of morality. The needs and demands of the community check the individual's devotion to self-service. Similarly the claims

of humanity at large are a check upon national egotism. These are the dictates of common sense, but common sense is very rare in international dealings. If the League of Nations Society wants the Golden Rule to prevail amongst States it must dig deeper than its formal programme suggests. It must encourage the mentality which regards class-war, trade-war, race-war, sex-war, creed-war, and every other form of unchristian hostility that flourishes in our unregenerate society, as the seeds or shoots of which international war is the evil fruit. And all Christian folk will surely second the efforts of the Society; heavy indeed is his responsibility who does anything, by exaggerating difficulties or professing doubts, to delay the return of peace and justice to a war-stricken world.

**Widespread
Labour Unrest.**

The existence of widespread labour unrest has not been fully realized by those who do not come into contact with labour, but the Report issued by the eight Government commissions appointed to gauge the causes and extent of trouble amongst the working classes should convince the least observant of its seriousness. It has not yet amounted to a stop-the-war outcry. Labour at home is substantially loyal to labour in the trenches, but unless remedies are speedily found it will soon become difficult to maintain the workers in the conviction that their welfare depends on the overthrow of Germany. The main remedy appears to be to treat them like human beings, *i.e.*, to show that their grievances are really considered and understood, and that there is a real desire and effort to remove them. Some words of Mr. Prothero's, lately uttered in the House of Commons about the agricultural labourer, show that one politician, at any rate, is alive to this need. Speaking of the living wage he deprecated the notion that it should aim at nothing but the maintenance of physical efficiency.

It is not a question [he said] of the necessities of life or of the decencies of life. I will go further and say it is a question of the luxuries of life. It is not a man's calling to be a labourer or a lawyer or even a land agent. In the wide sense of the word a man's calling is to be a man, a living man, a citizen of no mean city and interested in its government. It is important to provide the means for training a man for his hours of leisure as well as for his working hours. To think of wages in any other sense would in these democratic days be heading straight for destruction.

These are notable words in such a place, and we trust they will be echoed in all other Government departments and, further,

that all employers will take example from Lord Levershulme, who has set his face against workmen being treated merely as "hands." By calling one section of the population, and that by far the larger, the working-class, we inevitably suggest the reflection that the rest are parasites, drones, non-workers. There should be no working-class in any well-ordered community, for each member of the community should return service in one form or another for the advantages the community confers on him.

**The Causes
of
Labour Unrest.**

The causes of labour unrest are partly those inherent in our unhealthy industrial system and partly those induced by war-conditions. The Commissioners sum them up as,—incessant pressure, insecurity of status owing to constant "comings-out," the influx of unskilled labour at equal or greater rates of pay, arbitrary treatment by employers and Government officials, mistrust of "a capitalistic Government," an artificial scarcity of their accustomed refreshments, the well-grounded suspicion that food and other necessities have become dearer because of unjust manipulations of the market, above all, the feeling that, whilst they are in many cases labouring as directly in the service of the State as are the soldiers, part of their labour goes to enrich others who are making little or no sacrifice but rather benefiting by the war. In a word, unrest is due to an all-round sense of injustice. *The Athenæum*, which has concluded an unofficial inquiry and issues the result in its July Supplement, comes to practically the same conclusions, and adds that the Russian Revolution has had a marked influence. There Labour has passed in one bound from ruthless exploitation to complete freedom, and, naturally enough, has got out of all control: there the agricultural labourer by a similar reaction has appropriated estates in various quarters not without murders of the proprietors. The reverberation of these events cannot but affect a populace full of discontent with existing conditions. And now we learn that the Russian Committee of Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates are going to send representatives to an English body with the same grotesque name—the offspring of the recent I.L.P. meeting at Leeds. Let us never forget that patriotism, though a plant of natural growth, may be withered or stunted if the soil and climate are adverse. Lord Roberts, a shrewd observer, once declared—

To millions of our people engaged in daily toil the call to sacrifice themselves for their country must seem an insult to their reason, for the conditions amongst which they live make their lives already an unending sacrifice.

If this is true even of a moiety of the "workers," can we wonder at the prevalence of "unrest" amongst them?

**Dangers in
Canada.**

We have said elsewhere in this issue that the only just basis of treatment of different civilized races within the same State is a practical recognition of equal political rights and the avoidance of even the appearance of racial discrimination. The spirit of Ascendancy, whether amongst the Magyars of Hungary or the Northern Protestants in Ireland, is always productive of unrest and disunion. Its latest manifestation has occurred in the great Dominion of Canada, wherein some of the French population, openly despised by many of their British fellow-citizens on grounds of race and creed, and subjected to unfair discrimination on the score of language, have in retaliation resisted the movement for conscription favoured by the British. The unity of the Dominion is seriously threatened, and with it the gallant contribution made by Canada towards success in the war. We have from time to time dealt with the question of race, religion and language in Canada.¹ They are, as always, intimately connected, and an attack on one is generally reckoned an attack on all three. It is now becoming more widely recognized that the decision of the Privy Council at the end of 1916, which interpreted the North America Act of 1867 as securing the rights of minorities only in respect to religion and not to language, has inflicted a grave injustice on the French minority in Ontario. The Provincial legislature there has proceeded in its policy of discouraging the use of the French language in the French-English schools, whether Catholic or Provincial, of that Province, so that French children will have to receive their education in what is to them a foreign language. The fetish of uniformity and efficiency, so often abused to our disadvantage over here, is made the plea, whereas the real motive is the denationalization of the French element in Ontario. In the Catholic Province of Quebec, on the other hand, the English-speaking minority is treated with the utmost consideration, and no trace of educational injustice is to be found in Provincial legislation there. The French who saved the Dominion for the British Flag have always loyally observed the spirit of the Act of Federation. Not long ago General Smuts,² by way of accounting for the Boers' ready acceptance of a place in the Commonwealth, said:

Even nations that have fought against you feel that their interests, their language, their religions and all their cultural interests are as safe and as secure under the British flag as those of the children of your household and your own blood.

¹ See *THE MONTH*, Feb. 1910; June, 1916.

² Speech, May 13, 1917.

The acts of the Ontario legislature give the lie to this fair ideal. There is now no security for French interests in Canada in any region where the French are in a minority. *They* know well enough who it is that is thus assailing their faith under cover of their language. They have too much experience of the subtle and brutal methods of Orangeism not to recognize its hand here. Wherever it operates, in Ireland, in Australia, in Canada, the one aim of this detestable organization is the destruction of the Catholic religion. That it cannot bring about, but, unless Canadian statesmen are wise, it may well cause the disruption of the Dominion. The Golden Jubilee of Canadian unity has, through the rancour of a politico-religious sect, coincided with the gravest peril the country has had to face.

**The Massacre
of the
Innocents.**

It is a saddening reflection that this highly-civilized community has an unnecessary infant death-roll which will bear comparison with that of Canaan of old, or of China in modern times.

An attempt was made in July by the institution of a "Baby-Week" to educate public opinion both as regards the extent and causes of the evil and the remedies to be applied. The facts are sufficiently startling. Of the 800,000 children born alive in England and Wales every year only 700,000 reach their second birthday. The rest have perished mainly through preventible causes, and ten per cent of the survivors are physically imperfect. This alone, apart from the loss resulting from the sinful use of contraceptives and practice of abortion, is a terrible drain upon the national strength, and when we consider that three years of war have destroyed about half-a-million men, most of them potential fathers, and permanently crippled a much larger number, the urgency of making the most of our resources will be evident. But the first motive is the right of the child itself to life, healthy and intelligent: the needs of the State are quite secondary, though the State is justified in considering them first. It is not to be supposed that the 100,000 innocents annually massacred are deliberately done to death. That may happen in certain cases, but the main causes are the physical incapacity of the mother and the unfitness of her surroundings for the production of healthy children. In other words, like destitution, drink, and other problems, that of infant mortality is one of a host of interacting causes, so that the remedy to be effective must be very wide-reaching. Mothers may be ignorant of what secures their own and their infants' welfare, but knowledge will not cure them unless they have also the means of supplying their deficiencies. So the whole dismal catalogue of the disabilities of the poor—crowded and insanitary dwellings, incessant work, inadequate pay, bad food, occupational disease, imperfect edu-

cation, few opportunities for proper recreation—all these combine to make war upon the child. The State in its own pressing need, the Christian urged by the charity of Christ, must labour to remove those causes. And the chief objects of attack should be the slum-dwelling and the sweated wage and, so far as they are guilty of maintaining those abominations, the slum-landlord and the sweater.

**Conscientious
Objectors.**

A proposal to disfranchise "conscientious objectors" was defeated on June 27th in the House of Commons, not on the intrinsic merits of the case but simply because since the status of such men had already by the Military Service Act been admitted as legal. The conscientious objectors whom members had in mind were those who hold that all war is immoral, not those, who, while willing to engage in a war which was just, consider that the present war does not fulfil that requirement. Although a plausible case could be made out for the denial of State rights to these who refuse one of the chief burdens of the State, we consider the decision of the House a sound one, because it acknowledges and proclaims that the citizen has a higher duty than obedience to the State; a thoroughly Christian view which Catholics have always been ready to uphold with their lives.

Zionism.

The great war is gradually working in favour of the Zionist movement for providing for the Jewish people "a home in Palestine secured by public law"—the official description of its aim. The Russian Revolution has swept away innumerable obstacles; the approaching reduction of the Turk to political impotence, at least in Europe and in Palestine, will clear the ground still further. The Allied Nations will probably raise no objection to the creation of a national home for Judaism in its ancestral country under some external suzerainty, provided the legitimate interests of other nationalities already residing in that cosmopolitan region are respected. The Holy Father is reported¹ to have expressed himself in sympathy with the movement, provided only the Holy Places were safeguarded in the interests of Christians. The real obstacles seem to lie in the different views of the Jews themselves. Not all are Zionists, fearing that, if race and religion are once more embodied in a concrete nationality, their position amongst the various nations of the earth will become equivocal. No man can profess two nationalities any more than he can profess two religions, and many of the Jews, who call themselves and are English, American, French or Russian citizens, see no profit in becoming again Jewish nationals. To this the Zionists would

¹ *The Jewish Chronicle*, quoted in *The Catholic Times*, June 15.

doubtless reply that they do not aim at constituting a Jewish State in Palestine: all they want is that the Jews there, and others who may wish to join them, should be free to govern themselves and develop their particular national genius under the protection, like the other inhabitants of the country, of some great Power. Another more serious obstacle, commented on in the *Zionist Review* for June, is the presence in the movement of a Socialist element which has discarded religious belief and is aiming at secularizing Zionism.

**A Stonyhurst
War Memorial.**

One sad reminder of the constantly-increasing death-roll due to the war is afforded by the pages of our College Magazines, which are sedulous in chronicling the names and exploits and heroic deaths of their alumni, many of whom were still in their class-rooms when war began. The records of Stonyhurst lie before us, in connection with a project of perpetuating the fame of the fallen by some abiding monument at their old school. Of over 900 boys whose names have appeared on the roll since the beginning, about one hundred have so far met their deaths, whilst one hundred and twenty have been wounded. Amongst a large number of honours won, three V.C.'s are conspicuous. The Stonyhurst Association have suggested as a memorial—

1. The erection and equipment of modern Science Laboratories to meet the needs of the future on a scale worthy of the College.
2. The provision of facilities for the education at Stonyhurst of sons and other dependents of old Alumni killed in the war.
3. The foundation of a weekly Requiem Mass for the souls of all old boys who have laid down their lives for their country.

With a courage born of experience of the generosity which the war has stimulated in all hearts, the Association appeal to past students and friends of the College for the sum of £20,000 to carry out these projects.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Assumption, Feast of [H. Thurston in *Month*, August, 1917, p. 121]. Should the doctrine be defined now? [S. F. D. Fox in *Catholic Review*, July—Sept. 1917, p. 128].

Conscription, The Justice of [J. H. Fisher, S.J., in *America*, June 23, 1917, p. 262].

Sacrifice and Oblation [Dom B. Steuart, O.S.B., in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, July, 1917, p. 1].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Atheism, The, of William James [W. Drum, S.J., in *Ecclesiastical Review*, June, 1917, p. 643].

Freemasonry [Rev. J. M. Cooper in *Ecclesiastical Review*, June, July, 1917]. [H. Thurston in *Month*, June, 1917, p. 529].

Luther and Social Life [J. Husslein, S.J., in *America*, June 23, 1917, p. 260]. **Luther, Slaves and Peasants** [*Idem* in *America*, June 30, 1917, p. 287].

Providence and the War [A. Eymieu in *Etudes*, July 5, 1917, p. 5].

Real Presence, Bishop Gore on the [*Tablet*, July 21, 1917, p. 69].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Anglican Prayer-Book Revision [S. F. Smith in *Month*, August, 1917, p. 146].

Catechism, Learning the, by heart [L. Hénin in *Revue du Clergé Français*, July 1, 1917, p. 5].

De Mun, Albert [J. B. Milburn in *Dublin Review*, July, 1917, p. 26].

Gibbons, Cardinal: His career [*Tablet*, July 21, 1917, p. 71].

Jew, Why we should seek to convert the [Father Bede Jarrett, O.P., in *Universe*, June 29, 1917].

Juvenile Delinquency: Facts and causes [Rev. Canon Rawnsley in *Hibbert Journal*, July, 1917, p. 651].

Mexico [Francis Kelley in *Dublin Review*, July, 1917, p. 79].

Popes, The, as Peacemakers [S. F. Smith, S.J., in *Month*, July, 1917, p. 1].

REVIEWS

1—ABYSSINIA¹

FATHER BECCARI has completed his admirable series of sixteenth to nineteenth century Catholic writers, who have described the missionary labours in the district called Ethiopia, that is Abyssinia and its neighbouring countries; and he now adds an "Analytical Index" to the whole series. This is almost more an encyclopædia than an index; for the scale is so ample that the references to important persons almost amount to biographies, while the notices of places might almost be called local histories. For all who care to study this ever changing, sometimes heroic, sometimes degenerate country, this index will be most valuable. It is hardly necessary to add that the index volume reflects all the good qualities to which we have drawn attention in previous notices; the learning, fairness and industry of the editor, the romance of Prester John with its prosaic ending, the striking zeal of the missionaries, the courage of the martyrs, and the curious by-play of international differences between Portuguese, French and Italians. A varied picture, with many features of permanent interest.

2—BENEDICT XV. AND THE WAR²

WE had not seen Father Anthony Brennan's *Pope Benedict XV. and the War* when we wrote on the same subject in our last number. Had we known of it we should certainly have referred to it then, for it is a pamphlet which should be in the hands of all Catholics who are zealous for the good name of the reigning Pontiff, and for adequate recognition of the splendid services he has rendered to the many victims of this terrible disaster. It deserves this for the comprehensive way in which he has treated the subject and the full record he has given of all that the Pope has done

¹ *Rerum Aethiopicarum Scriptores Occidentales*. Curante C. Beccari, S.J. Rome: Luigi. Vol. XV, Index, pp. 372. Price, 25 lire. 1917.

² *Pope Benedict XV. and the War*. By Anthony Brennan, O.S.F.C. London: King and Son. Pp. 62. Price, 1s. net.

in pursuance of the fatherly mission to which he has consecrated himself during this season of crisis. Father Brennan was moved to write by a pestilential pamphlet he came across last autumn, entitled the *Silence of Benedict XV.* That writer, though he styles himself a non-Catholic, magnifies in the interest of his thesis the power and influence of the Papacy much beyond the reality. "From the great Palace on the Tiber," he says, "the 'Prisoner of the Vatican' has the power to issue an Encyclical that would make the Lords of War tremble with fear and impotence." Did this greatest personage in the world speak out "it is quite conceivable that the war might be appreciably shortened with a corresponding saving of scores of thousands of lives." But the Pope has "kept a sphinx-like peace," "a strange silence in presence of the convulsion of nations, and the vast moral issues concerned." He has failed to do his duty through motives of fear or policy, and has met the forces of darkness by silence and moral cowardice; and this author is confident that there can be "no answer to this terrible indictment."

Father Anthony—who notes that the charges thus brought against Benedict XV. are all taken, without any appearance of having been examined and verified by the author himself, from the columns of the anti-clerical press—takes the five counts of the indictment as the headings for his five chapters, describing his own task as the very modest one (but which most of us would rather describe as the very useful one) of collecting and arranging the facts and laying them before the jury of "thinking people of all denominations" to which the accuser appeals. The five counts are (1) that the Pope has not spoken out to stop the war; (2) that during the war he has done nothing, his Church has done nothing; (3) that he has not protested against the violation of the moral law; (4) that he has taken up an attitude of neutrality which is cowardly and indefensible; (5) that by his silence he has compromised not only his own Church but Christianity in general. Under the first of these headings Father Brennan gives the substantive passages from the numerous Encyclicals and other utterances in which Benedict XV. from the first moment of his accession has spoken out by addressing himself to the sovereigns and peoples on both sides, appealing to them in the most touching terms "to lay aside hostile thoughts and in view of the horrors of the situation to meet together for the conclusion of an equitable peace." Under the second he gives the text of the

documents which tell how much the Pope has endeavoured to do and in many cases has succeeded in doing for the relief of prisoners of war, whether military or civil, making no distinctions, in regard to all this, based on differences of religion; but on the contrary appealing of his own initiative, in some cases in response to appeals made to himself by the sufferers, for the alleviation of the Jewish sufferers in Poland, or the schismatics in the Turkish Empire, or again for the Armenians in Asia Minor. Father Brennan gives, too, under this second heading many expressions of gratitude the Pope has received from those who have benefited by his interposition, some of which are particularly interesting as illustrating the extent to which the causes of individuals have been taken up by the Holy See. Under the third heading he comments on the anonymous author's charge against Benedict XV. that he has not protested against the violation of the moral law: he means by condemning the German Government for its unlawful violation of Belgian neutrality and the cruelties in express violation of the rules of the Hague Convention. Here Father Brennan observes that, inasmuch as the Pope was deliberately excluded from having his part in the Hague Conventions, he might have refused to take upon himself the office of watching over their observance by the belligerents. But in no way does he fall back upon such a plea, but has expressed his horrors of the cruelties of this most cruel of wars in the most various, energetic, and persevering language, as the citations given in this pamphlet bear witness. The one thing he has not done has been to issue a formal condemnation of the German, Austrian, or Russian Governments for their part in these cruelties,—a thing which, as he has told us, and as is indeed self-evident, he could not fittingly do during the course of the war whilst the holding of a judicial investigation to take the evidence on both sides was impossible, and which, moreover, would only have defeated his intention to work in the various ways he has selected so as to render to both sides the services that have been so valuable for mitigating these cruelties. But we need not enumerate further the details of the information brought together by Father Brennan. The specimens we have given indicate sufficiently the useful character of his pamphlet, and we repeat that it should be in the hands of all Catholics who are so frequently just now called upon to vindicate the good name and beneficent action of the Supreme Ruler of the Catholic Church.

3—THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE¹

ONE of the qualities which impresses the reader most in the earlier portions of this great undertaking, to wit, its spaciousness, becomes distinctly less perceptible in the two concluding volumes. Valuable as the record is, and admirable as are many of the criticisms passed by the way, one suffers in this section from a certain sense of compression, almost of breathlessness. There is so much ground to be covered that in such chapters especially as those on the Lesser Poets; Lesser Novelists, Nineteenth Century Drama, etc., the reader is ruthlessly dragged along at headlong speed. But he wants to linger, and he almost inevitably has a feeling of being balked because fuller detail is not vouchsafed. Probably the only conclusion that can legitimately be drawn is that all attempts at a history of literature, even though they be planned on the scale of the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, and centuries be spent over their execution, are eventually unsatisfying. To the end they must be counted as the apparatus of learning rather than the achievement of learning itself, whence it also follows that it is never quite fair to judge them by the latter standard. Regarded as apparatus the *Cambridge History of Literature* is, on the whole, a splendid performance, and, as we have many times observed in our notices of the earlier instalments, a really enlightened perception of the purposes served by such a work will justify in full the relatively enormous proportion of space devoted to bibliography. In the two volumes now before us the bibliography and indexes occupy, in the one case considerably more, in the other slightly less, than a quarter of the total number of pages. There is an immense amount of useful, and, we may almost say, unexpected information packed away in these recesses. The brief selected lists of plays in Vol. XIII., the dates connected with the growth of journalism and the launching of newspapers, as also the educational bibliographies in Vol. XIV., may be pointed to as specimens of what we mean. Of course there are bound to be inequalities in such lists, and it would perhaps be unreasonable to expect that the compilers should be interested in the Catholic aspects of these subjects. For example, Father John Gerard's admirable

¹ Cambridge. Vols. XIII. and XIV, pp. 611 and 658. Price, 9s. net, each volume 1917.

volume on *Stonyhurst College*, a model work of its kind, has a better claim to recognition than the scores of trivial school histories, devoted not merely to Eton or Harrow, but to Rossall, Tonbridge or Manchester Free Grammar School, all duly chronicled in the twenty pages devoted to the bibliography of education. After all, even in the seventeenth century St. Omers and Douay held a certain place in the public eye, fiercely as men reviled them. Has Catholicism fallen so low in this age that the education of its adherents has ceased to be a matter of interest? With the exception, however, of Newman's *Idea of an University*, to which a page of criticism is devoted, we have hardly discovered a single Catholic book in all the long list; and the one exception, the Memoir of Mother Francis Raphael (Drane), by Father Wilberforce, betrays a quite curious ignorance of the nature of the work thus included. Mother Francis Raphael wrote most appreciatively about Christian Schools and Scholars, and the Memoir itself is admirable, but she was not and never pretended to be an educationalist. Again, it seems to us that the Catholic side of historical research, in spite of a very honest and well merited tribute to Lingard, has been somewhat neglected. The research and historical insight conspicuous in such a work as Father John Morris' *Records of our Catholic Forefathers* are certainly of not less merit as a contribution to historical scholarship than the rare productions of Mr. Thomas Graves Law, who wrote, so to speak, as the advocate of the contrary view. The same narrow adherence to a certain prescribed standard of taste laid down in the common room and the University lecture hall is conspicuous in the chapters on Lesser Poets and Lesser Novelists. A critic in the *Dublin Review* has recently commented with severity upon the treatment meted out by Dr. Saintsbury to such poets as Francis Thompson and Coventry Patmore, and we are bound to say that the rebuke seems to us to be deserved. We have no wish to attribute religious bias to any honoured contributor in what may be called a national work like the present. But in this instance, Dr. Saintsbury's insinuation that Thompson owed his vogue to the fact that he was "taken up by benevolent persons in a powerful coterie" is surely, to say the least, a little ill-natured. One might pardon it in a review, but a standard History of Literature does not seem to be exactly the place for sword-play of this kind.

4—ORDERED LIBERTY¹

AN Anglican's belief, or at all events the view as to the nature of his Church in which he prides himself, is that it is a Church whose sobriety of judgment has led it to adopt a middle position between the two extremes of Ultramontane autocracy and Puritan individualism. He acknowledges that among the members of his communion there are those who deflect more or less to one or other of these extremes, but his persuasion is that those who pursue this *via media* are truest to the distinctive type of their Church. Not that even this position can be objectively determined. Its holders follow their personal judgments in deciding for themselves individually what is the middle way, but for Mr. Duncan-Jones it is that of a High Churchman who has "discovered at the Church of Our Lady, by Primrose Hill, that when the Church of England is allowed freely to express itself, and just itself, it is a thing of austere and virile beauty, whose notes are joy and praise and hope." One knows the type and knows how those conformed to it can exhibit many earnest and amiable qualities, including the power of appreciating zeal and spiritual activity in those of the other types from which it dissents, all which characteristics are evidently possessed by the author of this little book. But the logical faculty in which that type is so deficient is deficient in his book. By Ordered Liberty he means the combination of liberty to form personal opinions and translate them into Church action, with submission to the prescriptions of Church authority; that co-ordination, in fact, between these two things which enables High Churchmen, Low Churchmen, and Broad Churchmen to arrange their respective churches so differently and preach from their pulpits doctrines so hard to reconcile with one another. What, after the manner of his type, he fails to see is that the spectacle which his Church presents to independent observers, particularly in these days, is rather one of Disordered Liberty, indeed of this carried to the length of downright religious anarchy. He appears to be quite unconscious of such scandals as the easy toleration within his fold of dignitaries episcopal and decanal, not to

¹ *Ordered Liberty, or an Englishman's Belief in his Church.* Being the Hulsean Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge for 1916—17. By A. S. Duncan-Jones, M.A. Longmans. 1917.

speak of professors and incumbents holding posts of influence, who are freely allowed to repudiate the most fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

Mr. Duncan-Jones pursues his exposition of Anglican belief and practices as seen through *via media* glasses, under the headings of Priesthood, Nationality, Wisdom, and Hope of the Future, but in each of these he is very indefinite and unconvincing. He claims that his Church, unlike other outshoots of the Protestant Reformation, has preserved continuity with its past by preserving the Episcopate, but he is inclined to condemn its Bishops for consistently failing to realize the nature of their office and rise to an adequate conception of its duties; nor in his conception of their priesthood does relation to the Eucharistic sacrifice take more than a very subordinate place. The Nationality of the Anglican Church is regarded by the author as "an experiment," that is to say, on the part of Englishmen "in managing their own religious affairs without interference from the foreigner." The author thinks doubtless that this experiment is successful though conducted in formal opposition to our Lord's appointment of St. Peter to feed *all* His sheep without distinction of their nationality, but his many criticisms of the ways of his fellow-churchmen are not such as betray a very intimate conviction of its success. We find it impossible to summarize what the author fixes on as exhibiting the "wisdom" of the Anglican Church in contrast with the folly of Ultramontaniam and Protestantism, but in ending the chapter bearing this name he tells us that "the first essential to a practical increase in these principles is for the Bishops to forget that they are shepherds and learn to be foremen . . . because they are channels through which the Christian people both discovers and expresses its own mind, which, in its totality, and under the Divine guidance, must be the mind of Christ." We must suppose that the author finds such a pronouncement helpful, though we cannot for ourselves see how it has any practical value whatever.

In his chapter on the Hope of the Future the author discusses some problems which he anticipates will have to be grappled with by his Church in the future, but what we have already noted may suffice to give the reader an idea of what he may find in the book. A feature in the book which does not convey the impression that the writer is secure in his

facts is his disposition to lend credence to unauthenticated stories, as that Archbishop Sibour asked Pio Nono why there was such a craze for definitions, and his readiness to accept with veneration as certainties the somewhat oracular deliverances of "George Tyrrell," as he invariably calls him. To those who from long familiarity with the peculiar temperament and mentality which combined with many lovable qualities to make up the personality of that priest, this supreme confidence in his verdict is amusing, as indeed it would have been to himself had he been still living.

SHORT NOTICES

THEOLOGICAL.

PROFESSOR A. D. SERTILLANGES, of Paris, has completed his presentation of St. Thomas' Philosophy, two volumes of which, dealing with the general metaphysical aspects of the subject, having already appeared, by a third volume, *La Philosophie Morale de S. Thomas* (Félix Alcan: 10.00 fr.) wherein the great thinker's luminous treatment of the laws of human conduct is set forth succinctly yet in sufficient detail. The whole ethical confusion of our time arises from the conception that morality is something subjective and relative, not absolute,—that there is no fixed, unchanging norm by which conduct can be finally judged. How well it would be if our shallow thinkers were capable of reading and understanding a volume like this which is based throughout on the dictates of sound reason. The Abbé follows St. Thomas' order of treatment but the work is in no sense a translation: it may be described rather as a modern re-statement of and a reasoned commentary on St. Thomas' doctrine.

The latest volume of Messrs. Washbourne's English translation of the "*Summa*" (6s. per volume), the work of the English Province O.P., contains St. Thomas' treatment of the theological virtues. Under Charity he naturally discusses War, in four articles, the perusal of the first of which would benefit and enlighten our Conscientious Objectors. This great work is now nearing its close, the present being part of the *Secunda Secundæ*.

HOLY SCRIPTURE.

M. l'Abbé L.-Ch. Fillion of Saint-Sulpice, one of the Consultors of the Biblical Commission and a Scripture scholar of long standing, has utilized his knowledge of the New Testament to write a new study of our Lord's life, which he calls *Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ d'après les Évangiles* (Letouzey et Ané). It differs from the other lives of Christ, of which French devotion and learning have been so prolific, in its popular character adapted to the needs of the young and the unlearned. But it is far from being a mere harmony, for the author has given, in preliminary chapters on the Gospels themselves and on the land and people of the Saviour, and

in many explanatory passages in the narrative itself, the means of a fuller understanding of our Lord's career.

Students of Christian origins will be grateful for the excellent series of Early Palestinian Documents which is being issued under the editorship of the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. and the Rev. Canon G. H. Box, and published by the S.P.C.K. The latest volume to reach us is **The Apocalypse of Baruch, and the Assumption of Moses** (2s. 6d. net: bound in one). The translation of *Baruch* is taken from Canon Charles' 1896 edition and Dr. Oesterley writes an adequate Introduction. *The Assumption of Moses*, a Latin text discovered in a mutilated form in 1864 and ascribed to the sixth century, is translated by the Rev. W. J. Ferrar, M.A. A similar series of Early Church Classics is issued by the same publishers, to which the latest addition is **The Catechetical Oration of St. Gregory**, edited and translated by Archdeacon Srawley, D.D. of Wisbech (2s. net). The task of the Greek Christian philosophers was to draw out the implications of Christianity into a logical and coherent system, but, first of all, to show the harmony between revelation and reason, since reason furnished the common ground on which to meet their opponents. In this work St. Gregory of Nyssa, as all readers of Newman know, took an eminent part. Archdeacon Srawley interprets him sympathetically and, as far as we have tested the work, correctly.

WAR BOOKS.

One curious bye-effect of the war has been to stimulate interest in the antecedents of our German foes as revealed in history. Under the unpromising title, **Les Eternels Barbares** (Téqui: 1.00 fr.), M. M. Gailhac has translated sections from Tacitus' *Germania* and Caesar's *Commentaries* which go to show that the present Teutons are worthy chips of the old block. One feels all the same that, if history is tapped near enough to the source, the historical records of other nations might be found equally discreditable. But our author would contend that those other nations in course of time have seen the error of their ways.

The Rev. Paul B. Bull has published a book of sermons called **Peace and War** (Longmans: 2s. 6d. net), which put in an extremely clear and interesting manner the rational Christian doctrine on these subjects as opposed to the sentimental, materialistic, heretical views of the Pacifists. He shows how, in our disordered industrial system, there are vices tolerated or practised by the Pacifists which are much more evil than what they profess to be shocked at in war. In fact, a sound and wholesome economic theory informs these addresses and makes them more valuable than even their immediate purpose suggests.

The famous Danish writer, Johannes Jørgensen, has published some impressions of travels about the Belgian Front which have been translated under the title of **The War Pilgrims** (Burns and Oates: 2s. 6d. net), by Ingeborg Lund. These sketches are not mere descriptions, but concern the emotions excited by scenes and persons by one who is not only an historical scholar but a fervent Catholic.

An account of the retreat of the French armies through Belgium towards Paris has been woven into a story round the personality of a simple Franciscan nun of Dinant by Monsieur M. Reynès-Monlaur, and translated by M. E. Arendrup under the title of **Sister Clare** (Burns and Oates:

2s. 6d. net). The horrors of the Prussian advance and the sufferings of civilians under the policy of frightfulness are graphically told, but Sister Clare never loses sight of the spiritual side of things, is able to hearten and console her fellow-fugitives, and arrives finally at a pitch of heroism which impels her to succour and serve the enemy wounded. The translation is good if sometimes a little stiff.

FICTION.

On Tiptoe (Gill and Son: 1s. 3d. net), is a collection of bright little stories, humorous and pathetic, taken apparently from some magazine, and alike in this that they are all written by Irishwomen. Not all are of a high literary merit though they are all eminently readable.

We are so accustomed to regard Irish as a dead language that we take for granted that translations from that tongue must be made from its ancient classics. But **The Mother and other Tales** (Sands and Co.: 2s. net), is translated by Father Fitzgerald, O.F.M., from living Irish literature, Irish written by Patrick Pearse, one of the leaders of the Sinn Féin outbreak last Easter year. These stories were first published in collected form at the end of 1915, and in Father Fitzgerald's translation they have both the form and substance of real literature. The tales are of the simplest, but they deal with living people and are full of the spirit of the supernatural that is so evident in the "lonesome places on the edge of Ireland."

MISCELLANEOUS.

We are of the opinion of General Smuts that this confederation of free nations which, with sundry dependencies, Crown colonies, and the like, profess allegiance to the British flag, are better designated as the British Commonwealth than as the British Empire. The latter term, with its derivative Imperialism, has an ill-sound in the ears of democracy: it connotes subject races and centralized rule, policies imposed from above and taxation without due representation, de-nationalisation, suppression of native languages and customs,—in a word, Prussianism. So at any rate it is felt by many of the inhabitants of Canada, which nation consists of two very different races, one of which, the French, now in a minority through colonization whereas formerly it was supreme, rightly resents and resists the attempts, open and covert, to make it British. The attempts to de-nationalise naturally provoke an exaggeration of racial independence which is reflected in the political action of M. Henri Bourassa and his following. Some idea of the conflict thus excited may be gathered from the pages of an extremely able pamphlet by "Jean Vindex," called **Halte-la ! "Patriote"** (Rimouski: 50 sous), "Patriote" being a pamphleteer in the opposite camp. The author pleads for a sane Nationalism and ridicules all idea of revolt from the British connection, but is equally vigorous in showing that patriotism in no way connotes the adoption of British nationality or culture. The circumstances of the times lend a special point to his pleading.

We have often wished for a Catholic commentary on the great post-Reformation English classics when the pure stream of Catholic tradition ceased to flow in literature and truths became befogged in the mists of error. The work as a whole has still to be done, but from time to time we get

samples. Such is *A Great Soul in Conflict* (Scott, Foresman and Co.: \$1.25), which is a discussion of *Macbeth*, the most perfect play of the greatest English dramatist, by Father Simon A. Blackmore, S.J. Whether Shakespeare was a Catholic by profession or not, no one can dispute that he was Catholic in mind, instinct, and sympathy. It needs one familiar with the Catholic spirit to appreciate and illustrate this fact, and Father Blackmore adds a great deal to our knowledge of the play and penetrates into its significance more profoundly than most commentators. He shows us how at every turn Catholic doctrine is presupposed, not only as regards the main lines of Christian revelation, but as regards the details of moral problems, and how the phenomena of temptation especially are depicted with the utmost accuracy. To this specialized knowledge Father Blackmore adds a full equipment of general Shakespearean lore, which makes his book at once the most full and illuminative of commentaries.

A very complete and well-arranged account of the Madura Mission, a district in the extreme south-east of India 16,500 sq. miles in extent and numbering 270,000 Catholics out of a population of 6,392,000 odd, is given in the *Madura Mission Manual* (St. Joseph's Press, Trichinopoly) by the Rev. J. C. Houpert, S.J. Like all other similar enterprises the Mission is hampered in men and materials by the war, but the reader cannot fail to be struck with the amount of good work being done, and the spirit of hopefulness which permeates the record. Apart from its spiritual interest, the book gives a valuable account of the state of Indian society both past and present, and it is well illustrated with views of the mission work. How well that work is organized every page gives evidence.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

There are Jews and Jews, as there are Christians and Christians, and many would support the Zionist movement if it meant the relegating to Palestine of the Jew usurer and the Jew sweater and the Jew of the *Internationale*. But, alas! those gentry have no desire to return to agriculture, and the fourpenny pamphlets published by the Zionist Federation—*Jewish Emancipation* by H. Sacher and *Achievements and Prospects in Palestine* by S. Tolkowsky will have no interest for them. The former attempts to show that the opening to the Jew of citizenship in various countries does not necessarily mean a denial of Jewish nationality: the latter gives very interesting information about present conditions in Palestine where the Jews number only one-seventh of the population, and own only two per cent of its entire area.

Jews of another quality, the international financiers, are the subject of a vigorous address in the French Senate by M. Gaudin de Villaine, edited by Albert Monriot, with the title *Les Briseurs de Blocus: La Haute Banque et la Guerre* (Téqui, soc.). The accusation is sufficiently grave, viz., that the international Jewish banking-houses caused the war in the interests of Germany and are prolonging it by preventing the effective blockade of the Central Empires. The Senator goes into great detail which would demand more knowledge of foreign commerce and politics than we pretend to. We can only therefore record the appearance of the charge without criticising it.

It is obvious that Dr. Joseph Muller's learned essay on *The Pope as Peacemaker* (Canisius Press, Fribourg: 1s.), which was delivered nearly a

year ago at the *Cercle Catholique* of Fribourg, has an immediate bearing on the present and the future. It is not concerned with the efforts made by the Holy Father, elsewhere noticed in this issue, to bring belligerents to an agreement and to alleviate sufferings caused by the war, but rather develops the proposition that the Papacy, as pre-eminently a neutral and peaceable power, should be recognized by the nations of the world as the mediator *par excellence*. It first of all discusses the rights of mediation possessed by neutral nations and based on the terrible injury frequently done to them by a state of war, and then passing from material to moral damage, it urges that the chief guardian of the moral law is the person most concerned with its maintenance in the mutual dealings of States. Dr. Muller does not, however, sufficiently allow for the reluctance felt by many non-Catholics, naturally enough from their point of view, to increase in any way the prestige of the Papacy. We can only hope for their adhesion by pointing out that the Holy See has no political pretensions in this purely moral business of interpreting and declaring the law of God.

The burning *Question Bilingue au Canada*, elsewhere discussed, is temperately and impartially treated by Père A. Dugré, S.J., in two articles reprinted from the *Etudes* with the above title. The author does not disguise the difficulty of the situation. On the one hand a single language makes for political unity and simplicity of administration; on the other, the French element has just as much right to cherish and preserve its language as the English. Diversity of creed prevents much intermarriage between the races: and the natural fecundity of the French Catholics tends to make them outnumber the English population. By constant immigration of British stock, however, this tendency is more than counteracted, and there can be no doubt that in time, especially when the West is fully peopled, Canada will be mainly an English-speaking country. Be that as it may, justice and gratitude, we think, demand that the French rights to the use of their own tongue should be recognized and confirmed, at whatever inconvenience to their fellow-citizens. These latter may even benefit by the necessity of being to some extent bilingual. Meanwhile we commend the brochure of Père Dugré to those of our readers who wish to have a full understanding of the question.

De Genève à Rome par Cantorbéry (Lausanne: 50 c.) by M. André de Bavier, is, one may easily guess, a spiritual itinerary, not a Cook's tour. It is an exceeding fresh and interesting description of a familiar journey as viewed by one who began as a French Calvinist and ended, after an experience of the religions of England, in the true Fold.

A little drama which combines edification with adventure and, unlike most of those that have their scene during persecution times, ends happily, is called by its authoress, *The Spanish Crucifix* (Cann Cot, Shaftesbury: 9d. n). Miss Ymal Oswin has now many such plays to her credit, and this is one of the best.

The Catholic Truth Society, which already publishes at one shilling net Cobbett's *History of the Protestant Reformation*, has done well to reprint as penny pamphlets three of the most telling sections of that classic work, viz., *Social Effects of the Reformation*, *The Days of "Good Queen Bess,"* and *The Suppression of the English Monasteries*. The extracts are chosen, edited and connected by Mr. A. H. Atteridge.

The Catholic Mind for June 8 and June 22 continues its collection of documents of interest to Catholics. In the former issue we find pilloried

one of those constant outrages on justice inspired by hatred of the Faith—*Bigotry in Action*: in the latter, besides another sample of the same evil spirit—*The Present Condition of Catholics in Florida*,—we have yet another account of the state of affairs in Canada, which shows clearly how things stand at present and how they came, historically, into this deplorable *impasse*, when the Board of Trustees of the Separate (Catholic) Schools are in open and just revolt against the Ontario legislature.

The Talbot Press, Dublin, issue a really bijou Prayer-book at 1s. net called *A Little Golden Key of Heaven* which though it contains a great variety of prayers in readable print is in some danger of being lost in the waistcoat pocket.

Father Casgrain's *Catholic Soldiers' and Sailors' Prayer Book* (Washbourne: 1½d.) wisely combines a good deal of instruction with the ordinary prayers, and devotions for Mass and the reception of the Sacraments.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice).

- AMERICA PRESS, New York.
The Catholic Mind. Vol. XV. Nos. 11, 12.
- BELGIAN CATHOLIC MISSION, Stamford Hill.
The Belgian Catholic Missionaries of Scheut. Pp. 34.
- BEAUCHESNE, Paris.
L'Âme Existe. II. By H. de Pully. Pp. 86. Price, 1.00 fr. *Méditations du Prisonnier*. By Dom Hébrard. Pp. 228. Price, 2.75 fr. *Le Train Rouge*. By A. Bessièrès. Pp. 288. Price, 3.50 fr.
- BURNS & OATES, London.
Sister Clare. By M. Reynès-Monlaur. Pp. 191. Price, 2s. 6d. net. *The War Pilgrims*. By J. Jörgensen. Pp. 120. Price, 2s. 6d. net.
- CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
The Old Testament in Greek. Vol. I. Part IV. Edited by A. E. Brooke, D.D., and M. M'Lean, M.A. Pp. xxi. 222. Price, 15s. net.
- CARNEGIE UNITED KINGDOM TRUST, Dunfermline.
Report on the Physical Welfare of Mothers and Children: England and Wales. Vols. I., II. Pp. 434, 190.
- CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London.
Several Penny Pamphlets.
- ELKIN MATHEWS, London.
Stand-down! By D. H. Lea. Pp. 79. Price, 2s. 6d.
- GILL & SON, Dublin.
The Murphys of Ballyslack. By Mary B. Pearse. Pp. 251. Price, 3s. 6d.
- HEATH, CRANTON, LTD., London.
The Garden of Life. By Mother St. Jerome. Pp. 64. Price, 2s. net.
- KING & SON, London.
Pope Benedict XV. and the War. By A. Brennan, O.S.F.C.
- ROUTLEDGE & SONS, London.
Word-Book of the English Tongue. By C. L. D. Pp. vii. 216. Price, 1s. 6d.
- SANDS & CO., London.
Great French Sermons. Edited by Rev. D. O'Mahony. Pp. xviii. 300. Price, 6s. net. *With the French Red Cross*. By Alice Dease. Pp. 96. Price, 2s.
- THE TALBOT PRESS, Dublin.
A Little Golden Key of Heaven. Price, 1s. net.
- WASHBOURNE, London.
Thursdays with the Blessed Sacrament. By the Rev. C. McNeiny. Pp. 213. Price, 1s. 3d. net. *A Nativity Play for Children*. Price, 6d. *Catholic Soldiers and Sailors Prayer-Book*. Price, 1½d.

